

R. Murphy

VOLUME XV.

[Dedicated.]

NUMBER 7.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,

AS SET FORTH IN THE

Formularies of the Westminster Divines,

AND WITHNESSED FOR BY THE,

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

—
REV. JAMES MARTIN EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

—
Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where
is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. Jer. vi. 16.

Y
ALBANY.

PRINTED BY HOFFMAN & WHITE.

***** 1
1858-9

1850

NOTES

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

BY

JOHN RICHARDSON

ESQ.

LONDON

Printed by J. Sturges, at the Press of the University of Cambridge

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

DECEMBER, 1838.

ART. I. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.*

(Continued from page 201.)

Scarcely had the important work of organizing the congregation at Herrnhut been completed, when a storm gathered against it, which threatened its extirpation before it had taken root and gained strength. The old accusation against the Brethren, and especially against Count Zinzendorf, of inveigling people to emigrate from Bohemia and Moravia, was revived, and so strenuously supported by some of the Count's personal enemies, that the government was induced to interpose its authority. A mandate was issued by the king of Poland, who was also Elector of Saxony, ordering Count Zinzendorf to quit his majesty's dominions.

However unmerited the severity of this measure was, as it affected the Count himself, yet God enabled him to bear the stroke with christian meekness and fortitude, he made instant preparations for his departure.

In his conversations with David Nitsmann and other brethren, he avowed his firm belief that his exile was divinely appointed for his own good and that of the Brethren's Church. Some of his sentiments are quoted by his biographer. (Spangenberg.) On one occasion he said: "It is a proof of self-love when a person thinks 'I will die in my nest;' and such an idea may have a baneful influence on his whole future life, make him a slave to his own will and domestic enjoyments, and circumscribe his usefulness in the Lord's service. *That* place is our proper home, where we have the greatest opportunity of laboring for our Saviour." At another time he remarked:—"Nothing is of real importance but our salvation, and the blessing of this we may carry with us wherever we go."

The royal mandate arrived at Herrnhut during the Count's absence—when he had read it he said:—"At all events it will require ten years before I can permanently fix my residence in Herrnhut; for now we we must collect a *Missionary* congregation, and train laborers to go forth into all the world and preach Christ and his salvation."

Viewing the Brethren's Church in no other light, than as an institution re-

vived by God for the special purpose of diffusing the knowledge of scriptural truth among christians and heathens, he considered himself solemnly pledged to see to it, that this its destination might be carefully attended to. Hence it was the constant practice of the Count to seek to discover the peculiar talents of each member of the congregation, and to pay more particular attention to those who appeared qualified for service in the Lord's vineyard at home or abroad. When, therefore, he was no longer allowed to remain in Saxony, he saw no other way of attaining the proposed end, than by having those persons constantly about him who were under preparation for service in the Brethren's Church. These persons constituted the **MISSIONARY CONGREGATION**. In whatever place the Missionary Congregation fixed its temporary abode, no regulation considered essential to the constitution of the Brethren's Church was set aside, but enforced with the same strictness as at Herrnhut. Special attention was paid to the design of this institution; and for this purpose whole days and even weeks, were sometimes occupied in *conferences*, for deliberating on subjects bearing on the enlargement of Christ's kingdom in the world. An extensive correspondence was carried on with gospel ministers in distant places; and numerous visitors arrived almost every day to see and hear for themselves. The sphere of the Brethren's labor was enlarging more and more, so that there was no lack of suitable work for the Missionary Congregation.

But this institution, however beneficial in its effects, bore within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. It was too expensive a scheme to be long supported by so poor a community. This inconvenience was not immediately felt, as Count Zinzendorf defrayed nearly the whole of the expense from his private purse, occasionally assisted by members of the Missionary Congregation themselves who possessed independent property, while others performed various menial services without recompense, which superseded the necessity of employing hired servants. The Countess also, who herself superintended the house-keeping, directed the whole with so much prudence, that every thing was conducted in that frugal manner which was adapted to the future destination of the members of the family. In a few years, however, the expense far exceeded the means; and a more serious evil threatened the institution. Persons became connected with it, who, on farther trial, were found unfit for service in the church; and others, when the first ardor had cooled, lost their zeal. This institution, therefore, terminated in a few years; and the benefit for a while derived from it to the cause of the Brethren, has been as successfully attained by other means.

The first Synod of the renewed church of the Brethren, was held in the year 1736, in the castle of Marienborn, with which Count Zinzendorf had been accommodated by his cousin, Count Ysenburg Meerholz. The assembly was not numerous, but was distinguished by brotherly union and concord.

Synods were afterwards convened every three or four years. During the life of Count Zinzendorf, it was left to him to fix the time and place of meeting; and he also presided.

At the second Synod, which assembled at Gotha, in the month of June, 1740, a third bishop was elected. The choice fell on the Rev. Polycarp Mueller, a Lutheran divine, who had formerly filled a professor's chair in the University of Leipzig. He was consecrated by bishop David Nitsmann and Count Zinzendorf. This measure was rendered necessary by the projected voyage of bishop Nitsmann to North America, where the Brethren were about to form some colonies.

At an early period, twelve elders were appointed to have the oversight of the congregation at Herrnhut, four of whom were chosen by lot to be chief elders. After making some immaterial changes in their designation and office, it was, in process of time, thought expedient to nominate one elder to have the general inspection, not only over Herrnhut, but over every institution which then was, or might hereafter become, connected with the Brethren's Church. The individual holding this office, and called General Elder, presided at all their meetings for consultation, and his decision was final. It was impossible that this office, in its original designation, could be permanently continued without manifest inconvenience and danger. It argued well for the future prosperity of the Brethren's Church, that these evil consequences were foreseen before they actually took place, and a remedy provided.

In 1740, Leonhard Dober, who had held the office of general elder since 1735, being pressed with the weight of his official duties and responsibilities, tendered his resignation. But the Synod would not accept of it, not knowing any other person possessed of equal qualifications for the office with Dober. Yet, as the inexpediency of continuing the office began to be more and more felt by many, it was resolved to resume the consideration of the subject with as little delay as possible.

A Synodal conference was held in Red Lion street, London, in 1741. The conference proceeded to the consideration of the best means of supplying the office of general elder; the resignation of Leonhard Dober having been previously accepted.

They at length unanimously resolved to abolish the office; and instead of investing any man, however pious and deserving of confidence, with the authority hitherto exercised by the general elder, to apply for direction to the Lord himself, by the use of the lot, in concerns connected with the government of the Brethren's Church, in all cases in which the Holy Scriptures, and the leadings of divine providence do not furnish a clear rule of action. The transaction now related, proved the occasion of the more general use of the lot, in the government of the Brethren's Church. As the use of the lot has been objected to by many worthy men, and is liable to be misunderstood, a few observations may be added which will show the Brethren's sentiments on the subject, as they are contained in the authentic publications of their church.

"Though the use of the lot is not commanded in the New Testament, it cannot be justly called *anti-scriptural*; and ought to be viewed as a divine decision, according to the words of Solomon, 'the lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing is of the Lord.' As God himself commanded the use of the lot to the Israelites, as it was frequently resorted to during the Jewish dispensation, and as it was used by the apostles after Christ's ascension; the Brethren believe that even now the lot may be made use of in the church of Christ."*

It is a fundamental principle in the constitution of the Brethren's Church, that the lot ought not to be used in the following cases:

1. When the subject is clearly decided in Holy Writ.
2. When the will of God seems distinctly marked out by the leadings of Divine Providence: or, when the point in question is already determined by a fixed rule in the church. Its use, therefore, is restricted to those cases on which no decisive judgment can be formed by any of these rules, when much may be said for either side of the question. To

* Exposition of Christian Doctrine.

these questions belong the appointment of persons to the episcopal and other offices, the formation of new settlements, the establishment of new missions, &c.

The right of using the lot is limited to those who bear rule in the church, that is, to Synods, to the elder's conference of the unity, and to the subordinate conferences in each congregation and missionary settlement. No bishop or minister is allowed to use it privately.

Before the year 1747, six or seven settlements similar to Herrnhut had been erected in Saxony and Silesia.

At an early period after the renewal of their church, the Brethren formed acquaintances in England. To meet the wishes of some persons in London, who desired information of the establishment at Herrnhut, a deputation was sent thither in 1728, consisting of David Nitsmann, John Toelschig, and Wencelaus Neisser. This visit paved the way for many important consequences. The trustees of Georgia made an offer of a piece of land to the Brethren, for forming a settlement in Georgia, in the hope that its contiguity to the Indian country would facilitate their access to these savages, for the purpose of preaching the gospel to them. Unwilling to relinquish so promising a field of labor, a company of Brethren on their way to America, came to London, towards the end of the year 1734. They were recommended to the trustees of Georgia as Moravian exiles, who petitioned for liberty of conscience, and an opportunity of preaching the gospel to the Heathen.

In the year following, a second company of the Brethren, consisting of twenty-six persons, sailed for Georgia. Their christian deportment on the passage and on their arrival, gained them the esteem of the Rev. Messrs. John and Charles Wesley, who sailed in the same ship. Wesley's biographer observes, that "he" (Wesley) "began to learn the German, and the Moravian bishop, David Nitsmann, and some others, the English language, that they might enjoy the benefit of mutual conversation." It was here that his acquaintance with the Moravian Brethren commenced, which he cultivated for several years; and we must allow, that the knowledge he acquired by their means, laid the foundation for the great things which followed in the subsequent part of his life." The cheerfulness and tranquility shown by the Brethren during a heavy storm, and in the midst of danger, greatly astonished Mr. Wesley, as very different from what he and the other English passengers felt. "I had long before," says he, "observed the great seriousness of their behaviour; of their humility they had given continual proofs, by performing those servile offices for the other passengers, which none of the English would undertake; and for which they desired, and would receive no pay, remarking 'that it was profitable to have their pride humbled; that the Saviour had done more for them.' And every day had given them an occasion of showing a meekness which no injury could move. If they were pushed struck or thrown down, they arose again and went away; but no complaint was found in their mouths. There was now" (during the storm,) "an opportunity of trying whether they were delivered from the spirit of fear as well as from that of pride, anger, and revenge. In the midst of the psalm, wherewith their service began, the sea broke over, split the mainsail in pieces, covered the ship, and poured in between decks, as if the great deep had swallowed us up. A terrible screaming began among the English. The Germans calmly sung on. I asked one of them afterwards, 'Was you not afraid?' He answered: 'I thank God, No.' I asked, 'But were not your women and children afraid?' He replied

mildly, 'No; our women and children are not afraid to die.'" In another part of his journal, Mr. Wesley says of them: "They were always employed, always cheerful themselves, and in good humor with one another." The favorable opinion formed by Mr. Wesley and his associates, of the Brethren, they communicated to their friends in England, who were thereby induced to seek a nearer acquaintance with those of their community, who were still in London; and thus a door was opened to them for laboring in Great Britain, as well as in her Colonies.

At the joint solicitation of Wesley and his brother Charles, Peter Boehler accompanied them to Oxford, where he held meetings for edification, attended by members of the University and by citizens. He delivered discourses in Latin, and Mr. Gambold interpreted them for the benefit of the illiterate part of the audience. At the request of the friends of the Brethren in London, one of their ministers, Philip Henry Molther, was appointed to take the care of the society which had been formed in the metropolis. The persons composing this society were partly those who had been excited to greater zeal in religion by the labors of the two Wesleys, and partly such as ascribed their spiritual attainments to their acquaintance with the Brethren. For a while both parties walked together in love; but a difference soon rose between Molther and the Wesleys, respecting some points of doctrine on which they disagreed; the latter also disapproved of some rules which the Brethren deemed essential to the spiritual welfare of the society; so that a complete separation took place.

That Wesley's good opinion of the Brethren afterwards underwent a considerable change, all must be aware who have read his journals. More causes than one served to produce this change. Among these may be reckoned the zeal with which Count Zinzendorf and Mr. Spangenberg opposed the doctrine of sinless perfection, which Mr. Wesley strenuously supported.

The Brethren, were, in 1740, obliged to vacate the settlement they had formed in Savannah, on account of difficulties between the Spanish and English. They retired to Pennsylvania, and purchased a piece of land from Rev. George Whitefield, which he had called Nazareth. While these negotiations were pending, Count Zinzendorf arrived in America. He landed at New-York in 1741, and proceeded to Philadelphia. His principal object in undertaking this journey, was, to render assistance to the Lutherans, many of whom resided in the State of Pennsylvania, but were, with regard to religion, in a very deplorable condition, having few ordained ministers—and the christian instruction of their children being wholly neglected. He was gladly received by them, and the Lutheran congregation in Philadelphia gave him a regular call to be their minister, which he accepted. He likewise provided several congregations in the country with ordained ministers and school-masters, and with the concurrence of some of the most approved clergymen, established a consistory for the superintendence of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, of which he had the presidency during his stay in America.

Soon after his arrival in America, Count Zinzendorf became acquainted with Mr. Henry Antes, a German by birth, and a member of the Reformed Church;—his intercourse with bishop Spangenberg, who, on his return from a visitation in the West Indies, remained some years in North America, had been the means of confirming his faith in the Lord Jesus, and of rousing his attention to the unhappy consequences of the mutual jealousies among christians of different denominations. As a

means of healing this breach in the church of God, Mr. Antes sent a circular letter to all the German religious sects in Pennsylvania, inviting them to elect deputies to attend a general convention, proposed to be holden in Germantown, on the 1st of January, 1742. The object of the convention is stated in the circular to be: "Not to dispute and wrangle, but converse in love on the essential articles of faith, in order to discover how nearly all true christians approximate in their views of the fundamentals of religion; to come to a mutual agreement respecting all such opinions as do not affect the ground of salvation."

The proposed convention met at the time and place appointed, and continued its deliberations by several adjournments, in different towns, till the fourth of June, holding two or three sessions each month. Deputies from all the religious parties in Pennsylvania attended; two or three Brethren also attended, but rather as guests than active members. Count Zinzendorf was unanimously chosen speaker or president. This distinction he accepted, in his capacity as Lutheran minister in Philadelphia, and not as a bishop of the Brethren's Church. In order to obviate any misconception which might arise, from the official relation in which he stood to the Brethren and the Lutherans, he roundly declared to the assembly, that, "in coming forward on this occasion, he had not the most distant idea of uniting the different religious sects in Pennsylvania into one visible body, or of introducing among them the Moravian ecclesiastical constitution, but that his only wish was to be instrumental in grounding all parties on the alone saving doctrine of faith in the Lamb of God, as the Creator, Preserver, Redeemer and Sanctifier of mankind."

At the third session, the deputies, with the exception of two or three, bore a decided testimony in favor of the doctrine of the atonement. The few dissentients withdrew from the Convention; these and their congregations hated and even persecuted the Brethren; while those who agreed in the main with them, became more warmly attached to them and their cause. Some formed a union with their church—among whom were Mr. Antes and his family.

(To be continued.)

ART. II. *The Gospel hid to them that are lost.*

Mr. Editor: The following discourse is transcribed from a manuscript of a father in the Secession Church, the late Rev. Thos. Hamilton of N. York. The introduction and some part of the improvement is lost, but it is hoped these deficiencies will be no barrier in the way of the godly deriving instruction—edification from its perusal. TRANSCRIBER.

"But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not lest the light of the gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine into them." 2d Cor. iv. 3. 4.

I. It is proposed to make some observations about the gospel. And

1. By the gospel several things are intended in scripture.

(1.) Most generally it denotes an exhibition of the covenant of grace to sinners; a declaration of peace on earth and good will toward men; an offer and grant of Christ Jesus, and eternal life through him, to sinners even the chief. (Mark xvi. 15.)

In this view of it the gospel differs widely from the law;—the law demands something from us; the gospel gives something to us. The law addresses us with the language of authority, the gospel is the language of promise and invitation. The law declares our duty, the gospel our privilege. In a word, whatever the law demands both as to its precepts and as to its penalty, the gospel exhibits to our acceptance Christ Jesus, who is the *sum* of the gospel and is “the *end* of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” He magnified the law, and made it honorable.

To represent the gospel as a new law, requiring faith, repentance and sincere obedience as the condition of an interest in its blessings, is corrupting its simplicity. It is expunging all the grace of the gospel, no matter what is made the condition of a right to the blessings of the gospel, if it is something out of our power to perform. And is it not as impossible for us to perform the condition in question, as to obey the whole law? No man can believe, repent, or perform sincere obedience, unless he be renewed in the spirit of his mind. Faith and repentance are operations of the new man. But is it in any man’s power to renew himself? No, he is not born of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; but of God. If the gospel be a new law, it is not a whit easier than the old law. Nay it is harder for a sinner, who is without strength to perform this condition, which is considered by some, mild and gracious, than it was for Adam to perform the condition of the covenant of works; for his strength was proportionate to the extent of his duty, whereas there is no proportion between a sinner’s strength and the condition in question.

(2.) The whole of divine revelation, including at once the precepts and promises of God’s word, is called the gospel. Hence we are required to obey as well as believe the gospel. (2 Thess. i. 8.) However the whole word of God is denominated the gospel, because it is the centre in which all the lines of revealed truth meet.

(3.) The preaching of the gospel is called the gospel. Hence ministers are said to live of the gospel. (Cor. ix.)

(4.) The word of God which is contained in the New Testament, is called the gospel. (2 Tim. i. 10.)

(5.) That part of the New Testament, which contains the history of our Lord’s incarnation, life, death and exaltation, is called the gospel. (Mark i. 1.)

2. The gospel receives a number of designations which are designed to illustrate its nature and excellence. It is called the gospel of the grace of God, the gospel of peace; the gospel of the kingdom. But there is an epithet in the text which embraces all the other properties which are given to it in scripture. It is called the *glorious gospel*. This denotes two things—

(1.) The quality of the gospel. It is *light*. Light is implied in the idea of glory. The God of glory is called light. “God is light.” The gospel is called light to denote the discoveries which it makes; for “whatsoever doth make manifest is light.” To denote the purity of its doctrines; for what is purer than light? To denote the pleasantness and sweetness of the impression, which the belief of it produces in the mind, for “light is sweet and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun.” When the gospel is called light, it is opposed to two things, to *darkness* and to *dimness*; to the darkness of night, and to the dimness of twilight. Hence the gospel is a light in opposition to Pagan darkness, and to

the dimness of the legal dispensation, which, though light in opposition to heathen darkness, was dimness compared with the superior light of the gospel.

(2.) The excellency of the gospel. If it be light, it is a *glorious* light. This denotes that the gospel contains glorious mysteries. The epithet denotes their multiplicity, excellency and harmony—

1st. Their multiplicity. There is light in a ray, but in glorious light there must be a collection of rays. If the sun emitted but one ray, he could not be called a glorious luminary; but when he pours forth a flood of rays, he is justly entitled to that name. And what numerous rays of truth does the gospel emit? It is a revelation of the perfections and Persons of the Godhead. It describes the natures, offices and relations of Christ Jesus.

2d. The excellency of these mysteries. The light of the sun is more excellent than the light of a single ray. Now the excellence of the mysteries of the gospel appears from their author, nature and effects. They are divine. They are from God. They could never have been discovered by men or angels. "The world by wisdom knew not God." They produce the most important and glorious effects, &c.

3d. Their harmony and agreement. In glorious light there must not only be a multiplicity, but a mingling of rays. Accordingly all the doctrines of the gospel agree. They all centre in the person and mediation of Christ. They are called the "truth in Jesus."

4th. The grace of the gospel. The glory of the gospel is the grace of the gospel. The whole system of gospel truth is to the "praise of his glorious grace." The glory of the sun is too dazzling and powerful to be contemplated by the naked eye; but is yet pleasant, cheering, enlivening.

What glorious privileges does the gospel confer? The true believer is called to *glory* and virtue. The spirit of *glory* and of God rests upon him. Christ is formed in him, the hope of *glory*. Hence he justly rejoices in the hope of the *glory* of God. Accordingly the New Jerusalem is represented as "having the glory of God;" clothed with light like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal, (Rev. xxi. 11.) So the gospel dispensation* is styled glorious. (2 Cor. ii. 7, 8.)

3. The gospel is here called the gospel of Christ. "The glorious gospel of Christ."

Sometimes it is called the gospel of God, to denote that it originated in the wisdom and goodness of God; that it was published by his authority and designed to promote the interests of his glory. It is here called "the gospel of Christ," to intimate (1.) That he is the author and publisher of the gospel. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." He "is the Apostle of our profession." "He is the author and finisher of our faith." The gospel is not of men, neither by men, but of Jesus Christ. Hence he is called the "Sun of righteousness." The source of all that light which the church or her ministry enjoys. (2.) That he is the confirmer of the gospel. "All the promises

* This phrase *gospel dispensation* seems to be used by the author in contradistinction to the legal dispensation as appears from the passage to which reference is made. Viewing it in this way, with some latitude of interpretation, it may embrace the whole period of time from the beginning of the old dispensation, as it thus places the two dispensations, the gospel and the legal, in contrast. But if we consider the expression *gospel dispensation* as distinguishing the new from the old, and restricting the gospel to the former, it is not the "form of sound speech that cannot be condemned." (Heb. iv. 2.) TRANSCRIBER.

are in him, yea and in him amen, to the glory of God by us." (2. Cor. i. 20. He is called "the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." (Rom. xv. 8.) He is called the *surety* of a better testament. (Heb. vii. 22.) He is the testator of it, who by his death confirmed it. (Heb. ix. 16.) Hence it is called the New Testament in his blood. He confirmed the New Testament by his death, not as a martyr, but as the *surety* of it. (3.) That he is the subject of the gospel. It is called by the apostle Paul, who was separated unto it, (Rom. i. 1, 3.) "the gospel of God *concerning* his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." The mystery of godliness, which is the mystery of the gospel, relates wholly to the incarnation and death, &c. of Christ. (1 Tim. iii. 16.) Hence the glory of the gospel is derived from the relation it has to Christ, who is the image of the invisible God. That which treats of the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, must be glorious. The subject of the gospel is glorious, and so must be the gospel itself.

4. It is also represented as the gospel of the Apostles. "If *our* gospel be hid," &c. see Rom. ii. 16. This is not inconsistent with its being also the gospel of Christ. He (the Apostle) asserts his interest in the gospel, to denote the following things:

(1.) That it was a trust committed to him. He tells the Corinthians in another place (2 Ep. v. 18) that the word and ministry of reconciliation was committed unto him. He informs his beloved Timothy that the glorious gospel of the blessed God was committed unto his trust. (1 Tim. i. 11.) He urges Timothy to keep the trust which was also committed to him, (2 Tim. i. 14.) "That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us." "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." 1 Tim. vi. 20. "This charge I commit unto thee son Timothy according to the prophecies, which went before on thee," &c. Which shows us that all the ministers of the gospel, are bound to keep it as a precious trust, &c.

(2.) His confidence in the truth of the gospel. He knew he was under the influences of the spirit of God. His call to the ministry was miraculous. The sanctions of his doctrine and mission were miraculous. "Truly," says he to the Corinthians, (2 Ep. xii. 12,) "the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds." His ministry was attended by the seal of success. His preaching was in demonstration of the spirit and in power.—And in regard to his personal faith, "he knew in whom he had believed, and that he was able to keep that which was committed unto him against that day."

(3.) His resolution to keep the trust committed unto him. His confidence that a precious trust was committed unto him, created a determination through grace to keep it in opposition to all the enemies of it. He did not give place to them, no not for an hour. He earnestly contended for the faith, which had been delivered unto the saints and to him as an apostle. In no instance did he betray his trust. All the trials and sufferings and persecutions, which he met with, had no influence in shaking his attachment to the cause in which he had embarked. And when he came to die, he could say, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith, &c."

(4.) His love for the gospel; his gloriation in it. His language is the language of appropriation and consequently the language of love. Hence afterwards he calls it the *glorious* gospel. The longer he speaks about it, the greater was his estimation of it. Notwithstanding the god of this

world and his blinded votaries, opposed and rejected the gospel, he gloried in it. There were three subjects about which the apostle never speaks, but with ardent affection and admiration. *Christ*, whose name was to him as "ointment poured forth." Hence often when his name is incidentally introduced, he never leaves it until he has described many of its excellencies. The *grace* of God. He was an extraordinary example of the power and sovereignty of divine grace. "In him first, Jesus Christ had shown forth all long-suffering for a pattern to them, who should afterward believe in him unto life everlasting." He had taste in a high degree that the Lord is gracious, and therefore was constrained to celebrate his grace. He speaks of the riches of his grace; the exceeding riches of his grace; of the glory of his grace,—the gospel in which Christ and his grace are revealed. Before his conversion, he hated it. He breathed out blasphemies against it. But now it was the subject of his preaching, his meditation and conversation. He counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord. To the Romans, (ch. i. 16,) he says, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," &c. To the Galatians he says, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world." "He did not count his life dear to him, so that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24.)

Hence he was ready both to suffer and to die for the gospel. To the Phillipians he says, "Yea and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." (Phil. ii. 17.)

5. The interest which the Corinthian believers, had in the gospel, may be also intimated in the term "*our gospel*." Though the apostle was a Jew, yet he often identifies himself with the Gentiles to whom he wrote. This was calculated to conciliate the affections of the Gentiles, whose apostle he was.

All christians have a most intimate concern in the gospel. By the gospel they were at first brought to believe; "faith comes by hearing the word of God." It is the means of their regeneration, "of his own will begat he us by the word of truth." It is the means of their sanctification. "They are sanctified and cleansed through the washing of water by the word." It is their charter for the heavenly inheritance. It is the foundation of their faith, the source of their joys. It is a trust committed to them for the keeping and improving of which they are accountable. (Jude 3.) With propriety therefore it is called their gospel.

II. It is proposed to speak of the persons to whom this glorious gospel is hidden. They are described from their unbelief; their devotedness to Satan as their God; their blindness and their lost condition.

1. From their unbelief, "They believe not." To all unbelievers the gospel is hidden. Faith is the eye by which the glory of the gospel is perceived. But those who have no faith, have as little knowledge of the mysteries of the gospel as a blind man has of colors, or a deaf man of music. Unbelief is a plague of the heart, which hearers of the gospel should be solicitous to be delivered from, for while it predominates they will derive no benefit from the gospel, however pure or abundant the dispensation of it may be. "The word preached did not profit them not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." That you may understand its nature and be excited to strive against it, I will make the following observations. And

(1.) It is a natural plague. We are naturally disposed to call in question the veracity of God. There is not one doctrine contained in the Bible, which we are disposed fully to credit. We are especially inclined to disbelieve the gospel, on the following accounts, (1.) The sublimity of its doctrines. The gospel is the wisdom of God in a mystery. "Great is the mystery of godliness." It is beyond the comprehension of carnal reason; "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned." Mankind have naturally a pride of understanding. They are unwilling to believe those things which they cannot understand. Hence the many attacks which have been made upon divine revelation itself, by its avowed enemies; and upon some of its most glorious mysteries, by its pretended friends. But they are equally as incapable of understanding the least as the greatest mysteries. When our Lord discoursed with Nicodemus concerning regeneration, he answered, "How can these things be?" His conceptions were very gross and absurd. He apprehended that regeneration was a second natural birth; "how can a man be born when he is old, can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" (2.) The natural improbability of some of its doctrines. As there are some things in the gospel too high for the comprehension of the carnal mind, so there are some things which it conceives too low to merit its regard. It cannot reach to some doctrines, and will not stoop to others. Hence the cross of Christ was a stumbling block to the Jews, and to the Greeks foolishness. It offended the carnal faith of the former, and the carnal reason of the latter. The Jews did not look for the redemption of their nation by the death of their Messiah. And as little apprehensive had the Gentiles been that their world could be redeemed by the same means, which they considered as highly foolish and absurd. And the offence of the cross is not yet ceased. Many still view the incarnation and death of God's Son as improbable, nay absurd; consequently they view all the ordinances of the gospel as trifling and insignificant institutions, &c. (3.) A sense of guilt prompts to the rejection of the gospel. What proves the necessity of the gospel, creates disbelief in it. Guilt excites men to desire to have no intercourse with God. It was this which made Cain go out from the presence of the Lord. It was this which made the publican stand afar off. It was this which made even Peter say, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man, O Lord." A guilty conscience assures the sinner that God is his enemy. And when God comes to him, even though in the way of revealing and offering mercy, he is disposed to say, "hast thou found me, O mine enemy?"

(2.) Unbelief is a plague very hard to be cured. There are two circumstances which prove that the cure of it is difficult. It is a disease of the *understanding*; and it seems to be *reasonable*. Reason condemns some sins, such as drunkenness, licentiousness, &c., and aids in resisting them. But reason pleads for unbelief, what! shall a man believe a thing he cannot comprehend—what he never saw? It is a disease of *long continuance*. That person who was possessed from childhood, was hardly cured. The disciples could not eject the unclean spirit. Our Lord informs them, when they inquired why they could not, that "this kind go not out but by fasting and prayer." Unbelief is deeply rooted in our nature. We are born unbelievers, and unbelief grows with our growth and strengthens with our strength. It is only removed by an influence which is almighty and irresistible. It yields not to the most persuasive eloquence or con-

vincing arguments. How few believed in Him, who spoke as never man did? It was not overcome by the force of miracles. Though Christ wrought the most splendid miracles, yet but few believed in him. Even those who should have yielded the most ready assent to the report of the gospel, were most unbelieving, viz. the ecclesiastical rulers of the Jews, and Christ's own kinsfolk. The former gloried in their ability to resist his doctrine and miracles. "Do any of the rulers believe in him?"—And of the latter it is said, "none of his brethren believed in him."

And after the cure is begun, how slowly does it progress? How frequently do we find the people of God staggering through unbelief. Our Lord frequently reproved, and sometimes upbraided his disciples for their unbelief and hardness of heart.

(3.) As the cure is difficult, so the disease is **DANGEROUS**. It is seated in the vital part. It will undoubtedly issue in eternal death, unless cured. And often it comes to a sudden and fatal crisis. Unbelief is a fundamental error in religion, and therefore damning. It is a departing from the living God. It is ignorance of him, whom to know is life eternal.

It is a sin peculiarly aggravated, and therefore marked with the peculiar displeasure of heaven. It is a calling the truth, the faithfulness, the goodness and power of God into question. It is a direct denial of the truth of his word. It gives him the lie. No wonder, then, if God have evinced his displeasure against it, in a peculiar manner. From unbelief the Prince of Samaria was trodden to death in the gate of Samaria. For unbelief, the carcasses of several hundred thousand persons fell in the wilderness. For unbelief, the Jews were finally rejected, their country invaded, their city and temple laid in ruins; above a million of themselves destroyed, and the rest carried into captivity. In a word, wrath has come upon them unto the uttermost.

Let these and other considerations excite us all to take heed lest there be in any of us "an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God."

2. Those to whom the gospel is hid are described from their devotedness to Satan, the God of this world. Here we may enquire, what we are to understand by the world, and what by Satan's being the God of this world?

1st. What are we to understand by the world? Sometimes the world means the earth upon which men reside. (Ps. xxiv. 1.) Sometimes mankind. (Rom. v. 12.) Sometimes the wicked and unbelieving part of mankind. (John xv. 18.) Sometimes the Gentiles. (Rom. xi. 12.) It is taken here in the last two senses.—The wicked are called the world 1) to denote their multiplicity. There are but few chosen: there are few that will be saved. (2) Their attachment to the enjoyments of this life. In speaking of them, the Psalmist calls them, "The men of this world, whose portion is in this life." (3) That this world is their residence—They are the inhabitants of this world; not like the children of God, who are strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

2nd. In what sense is Satan the God of this world? Satan has no claim to the persons, affections and service of the men of this world. He is called their God:—(1) Because he has usurped authority over them. He rules in them as the children of disobedience. (2) Because God in just judgment has given mankind into his power as a punishment for their apostacy from himself, their only sovereign. In this sense, all mankind, when born, are the subjects of Satan. But there is a peculiar sense in which God gives individuals over to Satan in this life. When his patience

and grace are abused; when for a great while he entreats sinners to know and acknowledge him to be the true God and their God, and to worship—glorify him accordingly—and they refuse, he often gives them over and up to Satan. Agreeably to the imprecations of the 109th Psalm, “He lets Satan stand at their right hand.” (3) Because wicked men voluntarily devote themselves to Satan. Sometimes Satan is represented as their master. (Rom. vi. 16.) Sometimes as their father. (John viii. 44; 1 John iii. 10.) Sometimes as their king. Hence he is called the prince of this world. (John xii. 31.) But here he is called their God. They not only render him service as a master; obedience as a father; subjection as a sovereign, but worship and honor as a God.

But you may ask, who worships Satan as his God?

It is answered:—(1) There are some nations that worship Satan, &c. &c. (2) The idolatrous and superstitious worshipping of the true God, is the worship of Satan. The Jews offered their children in sacrifice, in imitation, as they pretended of Abraham, who had offered Isaac. But God declares that the sacrifice was to devils. (Ps. cvi. 37.) The apostle declares, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, though it was not their intention to offer them to devils, but to their gods. (1 Cor. x. 20.) The worship, which was paid to the true God, through the idols of Dan and Bethel, was in God’s estimation, the worship of devils. The priests, who were ordained by Jeroboam for the high places, are said to be for the devils. (2 Chron. xi. 15.)

Paul declares that christians, in partaking of the sacrifice of the heathen, had no fellowship with God. (1 Cor. x. 20.) *A false religion is a device of the devil; and those who are votaries of it, are the worshippers of the devil.*

(3.) The love and practice of sin are acts of devotion to Satan as a God. When a christian performs a good action, he worships God. He expresses his devotion to Him; for God has enjoined the action; he takes delight in it: he moves the person to perform it. His kingdom is advanced by it, and he confers a reward for it. Accordingly, when a man commits a sinful action, he expresses the same devotion to Satan, and for the same reasons. Satan requires his servants to perform sinful actions. Hence they are called works of the devil. He delights in them. He prompts to them. His kingdom is advanced by them. And he will pay all his servants their full wages. He will be the instrument as well as the companion of their torments.

3. They are described from their blindness. (1) We are by nature children of darkness. The natural man has no spiritual discernment. He may have strong intellectual powers of perception, but he is destitute of moral perception. (2.) There is a wilful blindness. Men are sometimes chargeable with shutting their eyes against the light. The wise man represents them as loving simplicity, hating knowledge, setting at nought God’s counsel, &c. (Prov. i. 22.) Isaiah brings the same charge against them. (Is. xxvi. 10, 11) “Let favor be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness: in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly and will not behold the majesty of the Lord. Lord, when thy hand is lifted up, they will not see,” &c. Job describes them as saying to God, “Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy way” Peter represents them as willingly ignorant. (2 Pet. iii. 5.) “Of this they are willingly ignorant.” (3.) There is a *penal* or judicial blindness. This follows wilful blindness. And it is blindness, with which God strikes sinners. When they will not see, he says they shall not see.

When they wilfully close their eyes, he declares they shall not open them again. (John xii. 39, 40.) This blindness is to be considered as a sin, and as the punishment of sin. In the former view of it, it is to be ascribed to the sinner and to Satan; in the latter, to God, who is the author of all judicial strokes. God blinds men's eyes in a way fully consistent with the holiness and purity of his nature. (1.) By withholding light. He does not make them blind. When he offers them the means of illumination, and they refuse to improve them, he often, as a punishment of their unbelief, refuses to give them an heart to perceive and eyes to see, and ears to hear. He blinds them not by creating darkness in their minds; but by withholding light. He counsels them to buy of him eyesalve, that they may see. But setting at nought his counsels, he refuses to repeat and enforce it, and therefore they remain in darkness. (2.) By taking away that light which he affords them, and which they neglected or abused. God often affords sinners a considerable degree of the common light of the spirit. He opens their understandings speculatively to understand the scriptures. Now when persons thus enlightened do not improve their light, God often takes it away from them. When they do not receive the love of the truth, when they hold the truth in unrighteousness by acting contrary to light, he quenches their light, permits them to fall into errors and into the practice of sins, which tend to increase the blindness and madness of their minds. Consequently, they must err and stumble in judgment. For none but those who are taught by the spirit have just conceptions concerning sin and duty, virtue and vice.

(4.) Satan employs the world to blind their mind. This is intimated in the text, where he is called the God of this world. He knows full well that the love of the world and the love of God are incompatible. "*He that loveth the world, the love of the Father is not in him.*" When the world engrosses our confidence and our affections in an inordinate degree, the light of the glorious gospel is eclipsed. The interposition of the world between us and the Son of righteousness produces the same effect in the moral world, that the intervention of the moon between us and the sun produces in the natural world—an eclipse. That the love of the world creates a blindness in the mind, with regard to divine things, has been too extensively exemplified to admit of a doubt. How did the love of the wages of unrighteousness influence the mind of Balaam, notwithstanding the clear intimations which God gave of his mind to him? The ass upon which he rode reproved his stupidity and madness. Was it not covetousness which made the Pharisees reject, nay, deride the doctrines of Christ? (Luke xvi. 14.) Was it not the love of the world which blinded the eyes of the rich man, so that he could not get them opened, until in hell he lifted them up, being in torment? Was it not the same principle, which prevented the young man who came to Jesus, from taking up the cross of Christ? He could not think of abandoning his great possessions and taking up the cross. Was it not the love of money which prevented Judas from deriving any saving advantage from the instructions of Christ, and finally, prompted him to betray his Lord and forfeit his salvation for thirty pieces of silver? Was it not worldly-mindedness, which made Demas forsake the society of the apostles and abandon the work of an evangelist? In a word, was it not the riches and cares of this world, which choked the word in those who are denoted by the seed sown among thorns?

Satan employs the world with more effect in blinding the mind, than any other means. (1.) The enjoyments of the world are sensible things,

and consequently have greater influence upon the mind, than the enjoyments of religion which are matters of faith, and to a worldly man, matters of uncertainty. (2.) They are present enjoyments; whereas, those which the gospel exhibits are future. (3.) They are lawful in themselves; and their evil consists only in the abuse of them. Hence, mankind are less apprised of their danger in blinding their minds. It is highly probable that more are lost through the abuse of lawful enjoyments, than in the pursuit of unlawful gratifications, (4.) The worldling and the covetous make the world their God. "Covetousness is idolatry." (Coloss. iii. 5.) It is true the voluptuary makes his belly his God. (Phill. iii. 18.) But the world, in a peculiar sense, is the God of the covetous man.

There are three things, which make any thing or person our God, esteem, trust and service. Esteem—that which we esteem the chief good and source of our happiness, we make our God. Now a covetous man views the world as his chief good. The temporary transport of passion no man ever yet pronounced his *summum bonum*, chief good. His reason upon calm reflection, declares them to be vanity and vexation of spirit. But the worldling views the world in a very different light. *Confidence or trust*—This is what the true God claims from us, but the covetous man gives it to mammon, his god. He makes gold his confidence. The rich man's wealth is his strong city. He "makes a mock at the counsel of the poor, because he puts his trust in the Lord. *Service*—our God is entitled to our service. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." And is not the votary of mammon assiduous and diligent in serving the object of his supreme affections and confidence?

That we are in danger of being enamored and destroyed by the world, appears from the many cautions and warnings which are directed to us concerning its influence. (Read 1 Tim. vi. 8-10-17.)

Having stated the ways in which spiritual blindness is produced, it may be proper to exhibit the evil and danger of it. And

1. It is an evil which affects our better part, our soul. To have a deformed mind, is a greater evil than to have a deformed body. To have the eyes of the understanding blinded, is infinitely worse than to be totally deprived of bodily sight. To have the soul diseased in the slightest degree, is a greater malady than to have the body covered from the sole of the foot, even unto the head, with wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores. In a word, the greatest external beauty cannot make up for the smallest degree of deformity of mind. Of this, however, but few are convinced. Hence, every attention is bestowed upon the body, to the neglect of the improvement and cultivation of the mind. Every means is used to remove a disease which threatens the body, but the diseases of the mind are suffered to commit ravages upon its faculties, without any attempt to check their progress. No efforts are made to subdue the pride, vanity, selfishness, malevolence, ambition, &c., and to nurture the "fruits of the Spirit, which are love, peace, joy, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against which there is no law." But this inattention to the moral improvement of the mind, is an evidence of the blindness of it. If men perceived the value and excellence of their souls, they would not neglect their interests. They would be convinced that it would profit them nothing, though "they were to gain the whole world and lose their own souls."

2. It is an evil which affects the best power of our better part—the understanding. The depravation of the best thing, is necessarily the worst of evils. It is the understanding, which distinguishes us from the

inferior parts of God's creation. The want of it cannot be supplied by a title to a kingdom or the possession of the whole world. Nebuchadnezzar's loss of his kingdom was great, but not half so great as the loss of his understanding. But the whole mind, blinded by the god of this world, is without an understanding. "The *fool* hath said in his heart, there is no God." "Thou *fool*, this night shall thy soul be required of thee." He is declared to be the most egregious and stupid of fools. "Vain man would be wise, though he is born like a wild ass's colt." He is like an ass, which is possessed of less sagacity than any other beast of the field; to a wild ass, which has received no improvement from domestication: to a wild ass's colt, whose stupidity is still greater than that of its dam. In a word, he is reduced by blindness of mind to a condition more degraded than that of the inhabitants of the stable or of the forest. This is the situation of all mankind (by nature.) Hence we are exhorted to seek the wisdom which is from above; and with all our acquisitions, to get understanding. And to stimulate our search for this inestimable treasure, we are told that the Son of God came into the world "to give us an understanding that we might know him that is true," even the only true God and his Son Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal.

3. Spiritual blindness is an evil which, though it primarily and principally affects the understanding, yet it also produces an influence upon all the powers of the soul. This follows, from the influence which the understanding has upon those powers. The dictates of the understanding have a commanding influence over the will and affections: when the former are depraved the latter cannot be otherwise. When persons become vain in their imagination and their foolish heart is darkened, they are also given up to vile affections. When they become brutish in their knowledge, they also become brutish in their desires. When Nebuchadnezzar was deprived of his understanding, the heart of a beast was given unto him. This is just the case with regard to every blinded man. He is set upon sensual gratification. He is after the flesh, and therefore minds the things of the flesh. He minds earthly things.

But the affections of the blind man are not only earthly and sensual, but devilish. His heart is filled with passions, whose operations are often pernicious to others, and always to himself. He is under the dominion of hatred to God and man; he is filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, envies; being without understanding—he is also without natural affections, implacable, unmerciful. Hence he is pronounced mad as well as foolish; "The heart of the children of men is full of madness, while they live." Hence he is not only an object of pity and contempt for his folly, but of horror and dread for his madness; which renders him not only the enemy of God, but of man. He is full of murder, debate, deceit. He murders his fellow-creature in his heart and sometimes lifts his hand against his life.

4. Spiritual blindness is an evil which increases in proportion to the time it is suffered to prevail. The mind is not blinded at once. As the natural darkness approaches by degrees, so does moral darkness. "Evil men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

5. What renders the evil of spiritual blindness so great, is, that it is judicial. God smites sinners with penal blindness for their misimprovement of the light, which he affords them. This is a judgment, than which none can be *heavier*. Natural blindness is no certain evidence of

the divine displeasure. To that question, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind." Jesus answered, "neither this man sinned nor his parents, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." But when a man is struck with spiritual blindness, it may certainly be inferred that he has sinned, and that the end of his blindness is, that the *wrath* of God might be made *manifest in him*. When God smites the ministers of the word with dumbness, or the hearers of it with deafness; (that is to say) when there is either a vail upon the word or upon the heart;—he inflicts one of the most dreadful judgments. How awful is the case of those, who, for their not receiving the truth in the love of it are given over to strong delusions, that they might believe lies and be damned. (2 Thess. ii. 10) Woe be to that person of whom God says: "He is joined to his idols, let him alone." "He that is unjust let him be unjust still." Woe be to him, to whom God says "Drink and be drunken, and spue and fall, and rise no more." (Jere. xxv. 27.)

But though an *heavy* it is a *just* judgment. When persons will not understand, it is just that God say and swear, they shall not understand. When they will not believe, that they shall not believe. When persons shut their eyes against the light, it is proper that they should be punished with the loss of the powers and the medium of spiritual perception. The hand and the foot which the idle and slothful servant refused to employ were justly bound, and he cast into a place where he would have no opportunity to use them. As God rewards the improvement of grace with the increase of it, so he punishes the neglect of it with the loss of it. "To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away that which he hath."

God severely threatens children for their contempt of and disobedience to parents. "The eye that mocks at his father and despises to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out and the young eagles shall eat it." (Prov. xxx. 17.) And will God let the person that mocks at his instruction go unpunished? God denounces an awful judgment on unfaithful preachers of the word. (Zach. xi. 17.) "Woe to the idol shepherd, that leaveth the flock; the sword shall be upon his arm and upon his right eye; his arm shall be clear dried up and his eye shall be utterly darkened." The same vengeance awaits those who do not learn and improve the word.

4. Those to whom the gospel is hid are represented as in a *lost condition*. All mankind are by nature in a lost condition. They are children of wrath, heirs of hell, without God and without hope in the world. This is not the lost condition intended in the text. The Son of Man came to seek and to save them who are lost by nature. But those to whom his gospel is judicially hid are lost without any possibility of recovery. Their being lost implies these things. (1.) That they are lost in the purposes of God from all eternity. The influence which the gospel has upon man, is but the fulfilment of the divine decree. As many as are ordained to eternal life believe the gospel. But to those who are not ordained to eternal life the gospel is hid; "The election hath obtained it, but the rest are blinded." According as it is written, "God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day." (Rom. xi. 7, 8.) They are vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. (2.) They are lost with regard to their present state. The "wrath of God abideth on them, and

they are condemned already." The gospel is to them the savour of death unto death. What softens and enlightens others, tends only to harden and blind them. To them as well as to others the gospel is preached, but as its glory is hid from them, they receive no advantage from it.

(3.) They are lost eventually with regard to their state in eternity. Thus their portion is complete. In this life they enjoy some privileges and comforts, but in hell they will be punished, not only with everlasting but complete destruction, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.

Oh! how great is the loss which they sustain. It is an *incalculable* loss. Were they to lose the whole world, it could not be so great a loss. The soul is precious beyond all other things. "What would it profit a man though he were to gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" It is an *irreparable* and *eternal* loss. Never will the light of the gospel shine into their minds. They will be filled and surrounded with darkness. Never, never will they regain what they have lost. They once had the offer of salvation and despised it, and therefore they never shall have another tender of it.

IMPROVEMENT.

1. Hence we see the sin and misery of those who reject the gospel. Their *Sin*. They are unbelievers. They neglect and despise the great salvation. They are devoted to Satan as their God. They give that to Satan which is due only to God. Their *misery*. They are blind. They are possessed. They are lost, &c.

2. Ignorance is a damning sin. Many suppose that their ignorance will be their apology in judgment. But instead of this, it will be the ground of their condemnation. Many perish for lack of knowledge. God says concerning them, "'Tis a people of no knowledge, therefore he that made them will have no mercy upon them, and he that formed them will show them no favor." It is life eternal to know the only true God. All Christ's sheep know his voice. In order to salvation, persons must first come to the knowledge of the truth, &c.

3. We may see that persons may have a great deal of religious knowledge and yet have no saving knowledge. It is supposed that those to whom the gospel is hid, may have a speculative knowledge of its mysteries. Hence we read of some who possessed the knowledge of Christ and finally fell away. (2 Pet. ii. 20.) And the Apostle Paul declares it possible for persons to be once enlightened and to taste the good word of God and yet fall away irrecoverably. (Heb. vi. 4-6.)

ART. III. *Recollections of a Sermon.*

MR. EDITOR.—It used to be a custom of the serious people in Scotland to repeat, as they went home, and after they were there, what they could remember of the minister's discourses. Some who were good at the pen took notes as the minister proceeded. Perhaps this latter method might be liable to some objection as a general practice; but the diligence used to retain the matter for the purpose of edifying conversation was commendable. It may be, that sometimes, they made words

to the speaker's *thoughts*, or even some little criticisms upon his discourse, still it was a profitable practice, and incomparably more like the Sabbath than that which has come in its stead. If you listen to conversation now on the Sabbath day, you will hear almost every matter touched but *one*, viz: the matter of the discourse. As to that they are as dumb as a stone. But if the *weather* is mentioned, the *news* of the day, the prices, the crops, the making of appointments, &c. &c., their heart is instantly full of thoughts, and they speak with readiness and ease, and their loud talk and smiling faces would lead one to infer that their wanton profanation of the Sabbath did not give them any compunction. When I was in Scotland, I used to follow the good practice a little myself, although by no means so good at it as many. I am loath to think of it being entirely given up. And with your leave, sir, I will tell you a bit of a sermon which I heard, that still continues fresh in my mind. I may, perhaps, put in some words, but I can safely say I will not do the sermon or the preacher any intentional injustice.

The text was Matth. xxvi. 21, "*And as they did eat, he said, verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.*" Christ had sat down with his disciples to eat the Passover for the last time, and their hearts were full of sorrow at the thought of his leaving them. How startling must these words have been to them! They could not well bear the thought of such an event befalling him at all; how piercing, then, to the heart must this have been to be informed that *one of themselves* would do this awful deed! The prediction was infallibly certain, it fell immediately from the lips of *eternal truth*, and the event was just at hand. Jealous of their own hearts, none of them durst trust himself, and they said one by one, "Lord, is it I?" and Judas with the rest said, "Master, is it I?" to whom the searcher of hearts replied, "thou hast said" as much as "thou art the man." It would not be easy to describe the mingled feelings that now filled the hearts of the rest to find that it was not themselves—but he who had outstripped them all in professions of love to their Lord.

What an horrible crime was this! Look first at the place and advantage of the man. Not *one* of my avowed enemies, but one of *you*, my professed friends, with whom I have been on the most intimate terms and on whom I was fully warranted to rely. Not one of my less favored followers, but one of *you*, my own children, my own household, who sit at my table and eat my bread; who have heard all my familiar discourses; have seen all my miracles—witnessed my innocence of the things laid against me. *One* of you whom I have ordained to be my special and honored messengers of my kingdom, and who have wrought miracles in my name. Look at the cool-blooded determination with which he did it! Although the design was formed in the darkness of hell, yet was it in the full view of the Omniscient One, and in the same moment in which his heart closed on the purpose our Lord announced the fact. (John xiii. 18–21.) I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen; but that the scripture might be fulfilled: "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up the heel against me." When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified and said, "verily, verily I say unto you that one of you shall betray me." Here was enough to have terrified any one who had not determined to go on at every hazard—here was the ancient prediction applied to one of them present—and to leave his mind without a doubt, the very deed which he had thought of is named in his presence by the Lord, who he perfectly well knew, un-

derstood the secret that was in his heart—"One of you shall betray me." Nothing daunted by this, he rises from the table to go to the priests, but before going, the Saviour hints to him still more pointedly that he knew what he was about, saying, "that thou doest do quickly:" but still he proceeded with his purpose. After two days reflection on the matter he continues to adhere to it, and at this time, just before going to perpetrate the awful deed, the Lord again warns him as in the text, and to add to the weight of it, he opens to his view the awful doom that awaited him: "good were it for that man he had never been born." But he, nothing terrified, boldly challenges Omniscience itself to speak, saying, "Master, is it I?" He was now made as sure as it was possible for him to be, that the ancient prediction—the solemn and repeated warning of the Lord, and the awful doom announced was meant for him, and would take place, but he was not to be arrested. The powers of hell were in his purpose, and he went and betrayed what he knew to be "the innocent blood."

Look at the contempt that was in the deed. It was a "lifting up his heel" against the Son of God for thirty pieces of silver. Look at the cruelty of it; he handed over *Him* who was the just one, the innocent and the holy Jesus, who never did any thing to mankind but deeds of mercy and love, into the hands of those that were thirsting for his blood. And look at the deceit and hypocrisy of it—he, too, would be deemed to be as full of sorrow at the idea of the deed as the rest, and said, "Master, is it I?" And to crown the whole, that expression, which more than all others is sacred to the purest warmest love in the heart, *the kiss*, is chosen as the signal to point out his victim:—"whomsoever I shall kiss that same is he, hold him fast!"

Words are wholly inadequate to express the fearful amount of crime that is here.

While I was musing on this awful deed, the preacher announced, as the next proposition which he intended to prove—That this awful crime may be *still* committed. What! thought I, how can that be? The sufferings of our Saviour are ended, and he is as far above the reach of his enemies as the third heavens are above the earth. But, says the speaker, (as if he had known the very thought that was in my mind,)—Christ has a *cause* on the earth still, and the man that will betray that cause would betray himself, if it were in his power—and Christ will doubtless reckon with him that "inasmuch as he did it to his *cause* he did it to himself."

The cause of Christ (says he,) is every thing in the church to which he has set his name, be it the doctrines of salvation by sovereign grace, or any of the ordinances for government and order or worship. These cannot be betrayed without betraying his name, and his name is himself. It stands for all that he is, God-man, Mediator. But that particular of his cause which is for the time contested and opposed by his enemies, (for some particular of it always is so) may be considered as in an especial manner his cause, as his whole cause stands or falls with it. Is the question at issue whether Jesus is the Christ? then that is his cause; or is it whether He is God as well as man? that is it. The betraying of his cause as it is involved in the truth presently contested, is peculiarly aggravated. It was this that made the act of Judas so aggravated. He betrayed the present truth. So far as he could, he overthrew the Messiahship and gave his testimony in favor of the assertion that he "deceiveth the people." This was to strike a blow at the very existence

of his cause in the world. Besides, Christ has a people in the world that are dear to him. They are given to him of his Father and purchased by his precious blood. They are united to him vitally by his spirit dwelling in their hearts. They are his body. They are himself. He that touches them touches the apple of his eye. He that persecutes them persecutes him. He that betrays them betrays him. These remarks will show that he *may* still be betrayed in as many points as there are points of attack by his foes, in all the doctrines of truth taught in his word:—in all ordinances for worship, and in every point of order and government which may be drawn into litigation he may be betrayed. Neither are you to think that “thirty pieces of silver” must always be his price. That is but the representative of innumerable considerations for which it is done. The prophet, in bitter irony, calls it “a goodly price,” but truly it is often for less than this, yea, for nothing at all, or to gratify one proud revengeful feeling. But pride, honor or emolument, is the most common price for which His cause is sold.

But it is not every one that can be a Judas. The ignorant may be as willing and wicked, they may bind and blindfold him, they may scourge and crucify him but they cannot reach to this crime; it requires *knowledge*. Judas knew who it was that he sold. He knew his purity and his power as the Son of God. Neither is it every one that has knowledge that can contract guilt of this character. They may show as much malice. They may impute his mighty works to a connivance with the Devil as the Pharisees did. They may ascribe every horrible vice to the influence of his doctrine, as Persecutors have done—may call it popery, &c., as deceivers and false teachers have done, but their knowledge and their malice combined cannot carry them this far, they must in some way be put in trust with the cause of Christ. But then they may. If a prince at his coronation should swear to defend the protestant religion and then do his utmost to favor popery, he would be a traitor. Charles II. did this in a most striking manner. And men in different situations may do it likewise.

But it is church members, elders and ministers that are most frequently left to fall into this dreadful sin. It is not to be looked for in the world. That private members have a weighty trust committed to them, I need not say in this place. Their hearts are the temple of God and they promise to keep it for him. They are intrusted with the cause of Christ in his truth and ordinances and laws, and especially with the *present truth*—to hold it fast—to witness for it, especially in their lives conformed to it and to support and spread it. If they shall open their hearts to some base lust, or give some idol Christ's place,—or abandon their profession for pieces of silver or acres of land or other earthly object,—or make of it a cloak to a carnal, ungodly life; or leave it unsupported and untaught how can it be they are not traitors? Or if they shall join the rabble that follow some Judas to aid him in his dark designs, their conduct is no better, and they are accomplices in his deeds besides. Consider my hearers, as you value Christ, what you hear as his gospel; search the scriptures to see if it is so, and what is laid down to you as the law of his house. Look to it brethren. Judas cannot act his hellish tragedy alone. There must be false people in the pews as well as false teachers in the pulpit; and think not that the judgments of God will pass you over as blameless because *they* pretend to be God's servants, and *you* pretend to hear them as such. The lion that tore in

pieces the man of God that came from Judah, paid no regard to the fact that he was deceived by the prophet that lied to him. It is often said among the people that apostacy and betraying Christ has been begun and carried on by false teachers. I need not question the truth of it; but I call you to consider how short a way they could go in their mischief and treachery, if you the people were neither culpably ignorant of the scriptures and your duty, nor *willing* to be deceived by them.—Were it not for *you*, no system of false worship could ever go into operation, nor Judas dare to approach with treacherous kiss his Master.—Had not you, the people, wandered after antichrist, he never could have reared his head. Think I beseech you how much of the sin of false and deceitful teachers lies at your door.

Elders also may betray Christ in many ways. They have a great trust committed to them, even the right administration of the ordinances of Christ in his church, and the preservation of her purity. And they make very solemn and express engagements to be true and faithful to the same. They are generally the most intelligent and experienced in the congregation, so that they cannot be supposed ignorant of what is entrusted to them, or of their accountability for it. Their station is at the door of Christ's house as porters, and their duty is to watch. If they should but fall asleep at their station it would be accounted by men a high crime, and is generally punished with death. But how *much* greater a crime would it be in them to open the door and let Judas in, or the motly rabble that follow at his back? Though they do not themselves in this case either give the kiss to Christ, or help to bind and lead him away, will any man in sober judgment say that they have not made the deed their own?

There are not a few that think they are clear because they sit silent in the court of Christ's house, while the plot is executing, or stay at home, with abundance of loud complaining of the evil done. But they are very far from it. If it were but their enemy's ox or ass that needed their assistance, they could not be clear. But who can tell the amount of their guilt when it is their Redeemer? Let not your false excuses blind your eye and sear your conscience. If ever there is a time to *forsake all for Christ*, and cleave to him with purpose of heart, it is when he is about to be betrayed by his professed friends, who eat of his bread. As you wish Christ to own you when he comes in his glory, "come forth *now* to the help of his people and cause, against the mighty."—Awaken up your souls to a sense of all the interests which depend on the vigilant and faithful discharge of your office.

Ministers of the gospel may betray Christ. And when they do, they come nearest to Judas of all others. To explain this, I would offer the following things. *First*, they give up worldly pursuits and give themselves to a long course of preparatory studies for the service of Christ. This is, in itself, a strong declaration to all, that their mind and heart are strongly with Christ. By this, they warrant all men to expect that they will, on all occasions, be clearly for him. *Second*, They have more knowledge of the cause of Christ, than other men. They know its worth. They know where it lies, and of course how it may be betrayed. Like Judas, they know the place (the point of truth or order, doctrine or discipline) where Christ is. Their mind has been often with him there. Their advantage for this is very great. For it is their calling, and their main business to be with him every day—to hear the words that he speaks, to see the works of grace and mercy that he does,

and the travel and the suffering that he undergoes. *Third*, Their office lies entirely in faithfulness to Christ. The call and occasion to be faithful to him is not a rare occurrence,—or given a few times only in their life or on some great emergency, that they may through infirmity be in danger of *forgetting* it. It is daily. It is always—on all occasions, and in all places—they cannot take a single step in their duty, understandingly, without being reminded of it. Are they in the pulpit or in the court, in the family or in the community, in their study or wherever else, the cause of Christ is standing in full view, and calling on them to be faithful. *Fourth*, Their vows of faithfulness are solemn, express, and often repeated. In common with others, they have at their admission to the church, and the Lord's table, and in public Religious Covenanting, solemnly engaged to be true and faithful. When they enter on the theological course, they substantially declare that this is their great and leading motive. When they are licensed, they do formally vow to the Lord Jesus Christ, as may be seen in the questions that are then put to them; and finally when they are ordained, they again vow to him, and with more particularity. If then, after all this, they shall prove false, words would fail to speak their guilt. *Lastly*, They know that the flock of Christ look to them as safe and trusty guides, who will not lead them astray. And if in this confidence, the people transcend the measure due to mere servants, ministers are the more bound not to betray them, and the more guilty if they do it.

To the question, How may a minister turn traitor to the cause and people of Christ? I will say a few things. The ways in which he may do this, are many; and the points of truth and duty, which may for the time be in an especial manner that cause, are innumerable. But in particular, when a minister seeks chiefly himself and not Christ, he is a traitor.—He has promised to seek the honor of Christ, as the chief end of his office. For this end it was given to him; but he turns it to his own account; he makes it a step to popularity. He courts applause, and is not content unless he is half worshipped by the people. To reach his ends, he scruples not to soothe their consciences and allay their fears, by flattering their vanity and sparing their faults. And what is this to the truth of Christ, and the souls of men, but betraying them unto their worst enemies? “a sacrificing to his own net and burning incense to his own drag.”

Again, a minister who lives an ungodly life, has a vain or filthy conversation, indulges his children in vanity, and reproves them not for sin; or is a worldly man, and ever upon the watch to increase his wealth, is a Judas; while in the pulpit he gives the kiss, and emphatically cries, “hail, Master;” but when out of it, he gives him over into the power of the wicked, to speak reproachfully and blaspheme his holy cause. His practice gives the lie to all the solemn truths which he utters with his lips. His office and his sound preaching, are turned into a cloak for covetousness, and a veil for the vilest of hypocrites. The more soundly and abundantly such a man preaches the doctrine of Christ, so much the more he wounds him in the house of his friends. He holds out the strongest temptation to his people to cast away their profession, as a thing of no value; and to crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.” If his testimony, taken as a whole, is to be believed, the Infidel is right who rejects Revelation as a fable.—When a minister uses his office and talents to supplant the true doctrine of the gospel, by that which is only a doctrine of men, he is a traitor.

Or which amounts to the same, when he goes over to another profession in which he knows errors and corruptions are contained—without warning to those who confided in him as faithful to his solemn vows—for the sake of popularity or wealth, he cruelly betrays the cause that was trusted to him. He causes agonies and unspeakable grief to the mystical body of Christ now, but soon or late it will return upon himself. He will come to say, “I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent truth.” When a minister prostrates the authority and order of Christ to his own self-will, when he had promised and it was expected of him that he would do just the reverse, and make his self-will bow to the laws of Christ,—when he tramples on it with his feet, as if it were a vile thing,—and to enlist men against it, calls it persecution, oppression, popery, despotism, and the like, what can he be but a rebel and a traitor both. He vowed most solemnly to maintain this order in the church, and to submit to it himself; but when it claims from him, in the name of Christ, the obedience of faith; he calls it a devil and a Samaritan, one that would rob the people of dear liberty, that he may arouse popular vengeance against it, and win the day. This is to betray the Son of Man with great professions of love.

So it appears evident that none in the visible church are secure against this awful sin. Private members are not, by their humble station or small attainments, below the danger, nor are ministers, by their high place and great talents, above it. All ought to be afraid.

The next proposition of his discourse was something like this:—This is sinning at so high a rate and so much beyond the common road of transgressors, that God frequently goes out of the ordinary way of his dealing with sinners, to visit the betrayer in a manner equal to his conduct. He mentioned in the illustration of this, several things that God does, chiefly taken from the fearful case of Judas, as,

First, He frequently causes them to be in one way or other turned from their place in the church, that his people may be deceived by them no more. Are they private members? he either casts them out of the church by a due course of discipline, or leaves them, and then they do it themselves. Are they ministers? they are in a similar way turned out of office. Judas cast himself from the apostleship. He fell from it by transgression.

Second, He sometimes lets fall a drop of his wrath in their conscience, which kindles a fire in it that cannot be quenched. Then the poor wretched man can take no rest. Instead of comfort from Christ, the very thought of him pierces his soul through. His thirty pieces of silver, or whatsoever else it was, yields him no satisfaction now. It turns round and becomes king's evidence. Yea, he must either turn evidence against himself, and say, “I have sinned, I have betrayed innocent blood,” or be consumed by an insupportable horror within.

Third, He said, the betrayer of his profession seldom got much respect paid him by his new friends. They know that he is a traitor, and they dare not trust him. As to his trouble for what he has done, they say, “what is that to us.” Just as the chief priests and scribes of old. They had no common feeling of sympathy with Judas after their end was accomplished. They had not a single word of comfort for him, but rather implied by what they said, that he must stand alone under the infamy of his own conduct. And it is frequently the case with those that betray Christ to please men, or become popular with a great party.

Fourth, God sometimes sets a mark of awful import upon traitors in

their end. Judas was an instance of this. Ahithophel his type was another. For a more full and particular account of the Divine judgments which are executed upon traitors, the minister referred us to the cix. Ps. from verse 6th to 19th inclusive, which he recommended us to read at home.

I thought within myself, at the time, of Bishop Sharp's death, who vilely betrayed the cause of Christ. But perhaps it would not do so well for the minister to have spoken of that in the pulpit. The case was shortly this. The Presbyterians entrusted him with their interest at the court in London, in persecuting times, but he, instead of faithfully acting his part in their behalf, turned Episcopalian himself, and came down to Scotland a bishop. It was not long after, till he was way-laid and shot in his carriage.

There were a great many more instances that could be mentioned. There are some of them recorded by Mr. Fleming, in the "Fulfilling of the Scripture," that are very remarkable. Mr. William Couper, a minister in Perth, and one who witnessed with much zeal against Prelacy, both by preaching and writing is one instance. To one who had gone over to the Bishops, and was entreating his charity, he writes as follows:—"Sir, For yourself I never hated you, but the course you are in, I never loved. How dangerous is their estate who cannot rise but with the fall of many, who in Christ have entered the right way to the ministry—closing these fountains which God had opened—doing in a matter of conscience with doubting turns men's light to darkness—whence follows induration. Therefore I cannot stand with you except to witness to God in my heart against you. Consider yourself where you was, and where you now are, and how very small the thing is for which you have left us." But the very man who thus speaks so well, shortly after turns Bishop himself, and was loathed by the godly in his turn. Some of his old friends brought to him some of his own Sermons and desired him to reconcile them with his after actings, which did visibly affright and disquiet him. One day being at pastime near Leith, he was suddenly terrified with the apprehension that he saw armed men coming upon him. Those about him told him it was no such thing, it was only a dream. Upon which he became silent and fell a trembling. After he went home he took bed and died in much anguish of spirit—often pointing to the earth crying, a fallen star, a fallen star.

Mr. Andrew Foster, minister of Dumfermline, was another. He was sent as commissioner to the Assembly of 1610, and solemnly adjured by his brethren as he should answer to Jesus Christ not to consent to any alteration in the government of the Church. Yet he voted for Prelacy, having got 50 marks from the Earl of Dumbar, (who made use of that argument to break some of those wretches,) a small sum indeed for the cause of Christ, and by him very dear bought. For after his return he fell sick, and being recovered he was seized with horror of conscience in the pulpit while preaching and ran out of it saying he had sold Christ for money, became distracted, and died in infamy and debt.

But to proceed with what more of the sermon I remember. The minister said that every one of us ought to take the alarm as the disciples did and say, "Lord is it I"—that there was enough of deceit in our heart to carry us all the length that Judas had gone. And if we had not done it, it was owing to the restraining grace of God—that we ought to distrust our hearts at all times—and keep a watchful eye upon all their emotions, motives and purposes—and bring them to the test of

God's word—and that we ought not to rest in our own examinations, but ought to engage Christ himself, who knows all that is in them, to search and try them until they are sanctified perfectly. In a word, that we would find that our greatest safety was in much, frequent, fervent, humble prayer to God that he would take the keeping of our spirits into his own hand.

Mr. Editor, if you think it fit for your Monitor, you are welcome to it. I remain your hearty friend, as long as you are a friend to the good old ways of

BY-GONE TIMES.

ART. IV. *Obituary of the Rev. Samuel Douthat.*

MR. EDITOR :—The present is a time of so lamentable a prostitution of the pulpit and press in regard to obituary notices, that the otherwise pleasing and edifying duty has greatly ceased to be interesting. Owing either to a vitiated tone of public sentiment, or a disposition in funeral orators to administer an anodyne to the wounded feelings of the relations of the deceased, even at the sacrifice of truth, the generality of our funeral sermons, &c. are little else than elaborate eulogies on the life and happy death of the deceased. What renders it particularly painful is, that the panegyrist is often not only destitute of proper evidences that the subject of his remarks lived and died in Christ, but a mournful array of facts to the contrary; and yet, regardless of the deleterious influence such a course must exert on the morals of the community, he ceases not to pour forth his unmerited encomiums. But still, where we see a faithful picture of a christian's life, and view the cheering evidences of his triumph over death, we cannot but admire it, and feel a holy joy in adding such to the number of those worthies, whom the apostle describes as having "all died in faith." A faithful picture, exhibiting the graces and cheering hopes of a dying believer, exerts a happy influence on the beholder, disposing him to live the virtuous life of such, that he may "die the death of the righteous." Perhaps something may be found in the sequel, which, by the blessing of God, may have this happy tendency. Some may think this notice out of season, a considerable time having elapsed since the event; but as it is not so much our purpose to bring the *person* before the view of the public, as some of those ennobling graces which characterize the life and death of Christ's followers, which were in some measure happily illustrated in the history of this individual, it is hoped the subject cannot yet be out of season for spiritual edification.

Respecting the birth and parentage of Mr. Douthat, it is deemed unnecessary to say any thing more than that he was favored with godly parents, who, like the parents of Samuel, devoted him to the Lord. This was a greater favor and an honor more desirable, than to have a royal ancestry, and to be born and raised up in the splendor of earthly courts, an heir to a perishable crown. At an early age, he felt the binding obligations of his baptismal vows, which in all their solemnity devolved upon himself, on his arrival at the age of moral responsibility. Of this he gave evidence by setting 'his heart to the house of the Lord,' and expressing a desire to serve him in the sacred office of the ministry.—

With a view to this, and as preparatory, he engaged in literary pursuits in the University at Pittsburgh; and under the superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Bruce, and other teachers of celebrity, he made such commendable progress, and conducted himself with so much sobriety and modesty, as entitled him to the respect of his class and preceptors.—The solemn appeal, “who is on the Lord’s side, who?” was nobly met by his public profession, “Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse,” having united with a few despised witnesses in the testimony of Jesus, displaying a banner because of his truth. Having finished his literary course, and looking abroad on Zion’s desolate condition, on hearing the urgent call to “come to the help of the Lord, against the mighty” in the arduous warfare waging against the kingdom of darkness, he was heard to say, “Here am I, send me.” Accordingly, in the winter of 1831, he entered upon his theological studies, at the Associate Seminary, located at Cannonsburgh, Pa.

During the long term of which Mr. Douthat was a student, he found it necessary more than once to engage in the arduous task of teaching school, in which station, the suavity of his manners, and his facility for imparting instruction, gained for him a high reputation among his pupils, and patrons. But the burden of the task, and the necessary confinement, proved unfavorable to his health. It is to be regretted that so many of our young men, who have an ardent wish to serve Christ in the ministry, being generally the “poor of the earth whom Christ hath chosen,” have to spend the primrose of their youth, and waste their youthful energies, cloistered up in a secluded schoolroom, with a few children, in order to obtain the means necessary for completing their education. It is specially painful to witness many families professing the love of Christ, who roll in wealth and luxury at home, and whose fortunes flow out in an abundant stream for personal aggrandizement, or vain gratifications; but when that God, who bestowed on them their wealth as his free gift, makes a call in his providence upon them, for a pittance to help forward some virtuous, indigent youth, pursuing an expensive course of studies, this abundant source is dried up; and if it ever flows to charitable purposes, it is in very scanty rills. How many, deterred by the expenses of such a course, might, by a little pecuniary favor conferred without any injury being sustained, be encouraged by them to devote themselves to this important service of Christ; and how easily could they relieve many, struggling with such difficulties, to the great injury of their health? But by a shameful and sinful negligence on the part of such as have wealth, many young men are either wholly deterred, or are permitted to waste all their useful vigor, and injure their constitutions, by the confining, arduous occupation of teaching; in consequence of which, they are incapacitated for pursuing their theological studies with that improvement desirable; and, when licensed to preach, they have not that bodily health requisite to usefulness in their office. Mr. Douthat enjoyed but delicate health during most of his term at the Divinity Hall; in consequence of which, he was induced to decline attendance on the Lectures that season, in which his regular course of studies would have terminated; but the ensuing winter he returned, and completed his course.

Being recommended by the Board, he, by order of Synod, together with Mr. J. McGill, delivered the usual trials before the Presbytery of Ohio, in the summer of 1836; and was by them licensed to preach the gospel of life to the perishing. He labored with great acceptance in the

several Presbyteries in the bounds of which he was appointed; and a good evidence of his usefulness as a minister of Christ, was given by an inviting call which he received from the congregation of Belmont and McMahon's Creek, Ohio. Being ordered by Synod on the Western Mission, during the fall and winter of 1836, he rendered useful services in watering this interesting but destitute portion of God's vineyard.—His zeal and diligence proved greater than his bodily strength, in prosecuting this arduous work. He had to encounter difficulties of such character and magnitude, as can be apprehended by none but a missionary. Towards spring he found his health beginning to decline, in consequence of exposures, and frequent preaching in unpleasant circumstances. Though his friends might regret to see him laboring with greater ardor than his delicate health warranted, yet the reader will rejoice to see manifest in him that devotedness and zeal, which is the distinguishing character of a true Ambassador of Christ, rendering him willing to "spend and be spent"—to labor "in season and out of season," and to give up himself, his time, talents, health and life, a sacrifice in the service of the Saviour, of whose great salvation he was the herald.

At St. Louis he embarked for Pittsburgh, where the Associate Synod was to meet May 24th, 1837, anticipating the pleasure of meeting with his brethren, and listening to their counsels. But God was, by disease, fast preparing him for meeting with "the general assembly" of saints and angels, perfected in bliss around the Father's throne, where Zion appears in her "beautiful garments," freed from the many defects and blemishes which stain her purest courts on earth. After landing in the city, he found himself able to attend Synod but about one day, till he was confined in his room. The Presbytery of Muskingum, wishing to present to him a call, had to repair to his own private apartment; and yet, hoping that he might be longer spared for usefulness, he accepted the call, purposing to enter immediately on the pastoral duties. But the Shepherd of Israel had purposed to take him to himself, and to feed him, and lead him beside fountains of celestial bliss.

He bore his sickness, and suffered his youthful prospects to sink in the gloom of a long night with a christian magnanimity. The writer had the pleasure of being with him during some part of his illness, and of witnessing him resigned, cheerful, pleasant, buoyant. Christ can make a sick bed a bed of pleasure, the hour of suffering an hour of rejoicing, the time when surrounding friends are weeping, the time when the soul in fellowship with God is cheered with the sweetest delight, with heavenly joys. When the man of the world, the devotee of pleasure, the worshipper of riches or fame, is prostrated by disease, he finds that he has made vanities and lies his refuge, that his streams of comfort are dried up, that all the resources of earth cannot administer the least anodyne for a moment to his poignant sufferings, and that a gloom of thick darkness hangs over the awful future, where death lives and hope dies, and remorse and despair his prospective portion. It is otherwise with him whose refuge is God, who in life by faith unlocked the fountain of living waters and drank the streams of spiritual consolation; having based himself on the rock of ages, he can with the utmost calmness and serenity of mind look down on the sea of this world's troubles, and though afflictions and Jordan's billows may beat sore against him, yet unmoved on this rock he is cheered with the delightful prospect of Canaan, and welcomes the messengers of death, which announce to him that within a few days he "must pass over Jordan." There was

evidence that Mr. Douthat was happily favored with that comforting and supporting influence which the religion of Christ gives to his true followers in the hour of trial. He was removed to a short distance from the city, where he lay till he was called home by death, which happened about two months after the meeting of Synod, the writer not being in possession of the precise date. He died resting on the arm of his beloved, leaning his head on his bosom, and expressing a confident assurance that he would live and reign with him who is "The resurrection and the life." He died lamented by his friends, beloved by his fellow-students, and respected by the christian community. His bud was just beginning to open on earth, and it was plucked by death to bloom a fair heavenly flower in Paradise above. Those who are candidates for the ministry, and they who have just entered on the discharge of the duties of this sacred office, are by this providence taught the value of time and the importance of embracing every opportunity of rendering some service to Christ. God has seen proper to call him, as he did Rev. Messrs. Wallace, McClelland, and several others, still dear in the memory of the church, just when they were making their first appearance on the stage of public usefulness; and thus at once blasted their own flattering prospects, and deprived the armies of Israel of such as promised to be efficient, honored leaders in fighting the battles of the Lord. Let all be instructed by such providences to improve the present time for doing good, and for preparing to meet with God in a dying hour and at the judgment, so that death may come not as a 'king of terrors,' but a welcomed friend, the key of life, the dawn of a bright day of eternal glories.

LA MORT UN AMI.

DEATH DESIRABLE.

- 1 Since Christ has vanquished death, his sting
 Extracted, spoiled of all his power,
 He comes a friend, not terror's king,
 His visit welcomed, wished for hour,
 The porter, key of life and bliss,
 And sent in love,
 By God above,
 To bring us into Paradise.
- 2 The captive pris'ner who long bound
 In loathsome dungeon dark has lain.
 With longing waits, till time rolls round,
 His wished release from gloom and pain;
 So do I long till death shall come,
 My prison ope,
 And give me hope
 Of freedom, life, in heaven my home.
- 3 As hireling waits with anxious thought
 For his reward on the pay-day,
 Or as the joy which tidings brought
 Of life to victim doomed to die;
 So waits my soul, such joy it gives
 When I regard
 My sure reward
 At death, when God my soul receives.

- 4 As he who long despised, oppressed,
Groaning in chains of slavery,
Welcomed the day, and fondly blessed
The hand which gave him liberty ;
So welcome I death's friendship too,
Which gives to me
A jubilee
From sin's vile slavery and woe.
- 5 Such joy as he who finds great weal,
Or pearls, or a rich legacy ;
Such transports as great warriors feel
Gaining triumphant victory ;
Such joys I feel when death shall bring
Riches to me
And victory
O'er death and sin, through Christ my king
- 6 Delightful pleasures must him cheer,
A husband, when from long exile
Sweet home he sees, his wife most dear
Embraces him with welcome smile ;
More pleasant still to me is death,
Which kindly lands
Me 'mong blest friends
In heav'n my home, exile on earth.
- 7 The crew long tossed on stormy seas,
With vessel wrecked, would gladly see
That longed-for hour when by some breeze
On shore safe wafted soon they'll be ;
More gladly still my dying hour
Shall be to me,
When I shall be
Safe landed Jordan's swellings o'er.
- 8 On tiptoe hope the virgin bride,
In raptures waits her wedding-day,
When crown'd her wishes, by his side
She loves, in bliss she seems so gay ;
My raptures more, purer my bliss
When dying I
Shall happily
Be wedded and with Christ always.
- 9 With anxious wish the royal heir
Awaits his coronation day,
When crowned, his earthly joys appear
Complete, so splendid his array ;
More splendid, joyous still is mine
When death shall crown
Me with renown,
A king with Christ, my bliss divine.
- 10 Suppose some beggar chanced at once,
Possessed of all earth's riches, fame,

Sov'reign of kings, and still advance
His pomp ; his joys deserve no name,
Compared with those enjoyed by me,
When death shall make
Me once partake
Of life, bliss, immortality.—*La Mort un Ami.*

ART. V. *Slavery essentially Immoral.*

MR. EDITOR—We live in a very important era of the world. The signs of the times strongly indicate, that God is about to overturn, overturn, overturn, every obstacle that stands in the way of His reigning, whose right it is to reign. "He will scatter the people who delight in war," beating their swords into plowshares. "Princes shall come out of Egypt." "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God," redeemed from temporal and spiritual bondage. It is therefore no time for us to fold our hands in indolence, at so important a crisis—every christian at least should be at his post, having on the whole armor of God, "that he may please him, who hath chosen him to be a soldier." That we may not be liable to the charge of standing all the day idle, when there is important work assigned us, and that we may avoid the error on the other hand, of using unlawful means to bring about God's promises, as did the father of the faithful, or that we may not be found fighting against God by striving to obstruct his purposes, thus "rushing on the thick bosses of Jehovah's buckler;" it behoves us to ponder our path, and to take good heed to the sure word of God, "which is as a lamp unto the feet, and a light unto the path." Of the many obstacles which stand in the way of Christ's blessed reign, in this professed christian nation, we consider none of greater magnitude than the holding the sixth part of our population "as goods and chattels."

Man claiming the right of property in man, we consider to be the corrupt tree, which bears all the pernicious fruit that can be attributed to domestic slavery ; and as long as *man* is considered *property*, no regulation of either church or state can remedy the flagrant evil. This depredator is unblushingly lifting its hideous, gigantic head, and corrupting both church and state with its noxious, pestiferous breath, in the very face of our free institutions, branding us as a nation of hypocrites.

That we have to grapple with this relict of barbarism under the noon-day sunbeams of the gospel dispensation, is truly deplorable. And that we are such "fools and slow of heart to believe" all that the prophets have so clearly revealed, directing our intercourse with our brethren of mankind, is equally so. The doctrine that all men receive from nature an equal right to freedom, is an unquestionable truth. Its antagonist, *many being made for one*, has not the most distant shadow of proof, in the charter of our rights, given by our Creator. If there is, who is to be the master ? and who the slave ? would be very important questions to be decided. We are surprised to see a writer in the September No. of the Monitor denying these self-evident truths. We

are sorry that so good a writer as A. R. should not have clearer conceptions on moral subjects. We think, if he would take a more minute view, through the glass that God has provided in his word, it would enlighten his moral vision. We are very anxious that so eloquent a writer as A. R. should use his pen for the advocacy of sound principles; for sound principles eloquently advocated, are like apples of gold, in pictures of silver.

In making a few passing remarks on the sentiments advanced by A. R., we may be rude in speech, but we hope we will not darken counsel, with words without knowledge. We consider it our duty to cast in our mite into the treasury of the Lord, for the promotion of the object for which Christ made his advent in the flesh—"glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good-will toward men." We do not profess to be qualified to "wield the pen of a controversialist;" but we consider it no time to roll up our talent in a napkin.

The weak things of this world, are often chosen to confound the things which are mighty. We hope that our few remarks will not be a means of preventing "An Abolitionist," from again taking the field, as he is much better equipped for this warfare, than ourselves; we hope we shall hear from him frequently. We account for the mystification of our brother A. R., on this principle, that familiarity with evil, blinds the eyes, and blunts the moral sensibilities; even Christians are not exempt from its contamination. He stated in a former communication, that appeared in the last March number of the Monitor, that he spent the most of his days amongst the slaveholders, and bore an honorable testimony to their hospitality, which we do not feel disposed to deny.

We think it is proper here to say a few words to correct a false impression, which is entertained by the votaries of slavery; viz: arguments given to show the iniquity of the system, manifest an implacable hatred against Southern men; and that it is equivalent to saying, that there is no good trait in their character; and that it is "consigning them en masse, to the regions of eternal woe." Against this perversion, we would enter our most solemn protest. That slavery has a most pernicious corrupting influence, on the morals of the community, where it is practised, we suppose slave-holders themselves, will not pretend to deny. We have no desire to hold up our Southern brethren as monsters of iniquity, more than any other portion of the human family, were they placed in the same circumstances; we do believe and are sure, many of them possess amiable qualities. It is not because we do not love them, "God knoweth," that we endeavor to impress them with the evils of slavery. We sincerely believe, that it is for their interest, both in time and eternity, to abolish slavery. Are we "become their enemy because we tell them the truth?" We hope we will not be found bringing any railing accusation against slaveholders; but hope to be enabled to speak the truth, with love; notwithstanding, we must be permitted to use such language, as will convey the truth.

To return from this digression—we were speaking of the honorable testimony, which was borne to the character of slaveholders, respecting their hospitality. Hospitality is certainly a very commendable virtue, when conducted on christian principles. Though, bad as mankind are, it is not peculiar to christian communities; as there are many savages, who hold sacred the rules of hospitality; and we might confide in their protection for the safety of our persons, even supposing our mission to them were to root out their long established institutions—were

not this the case, an end would be put to all hopes of planting the standard of the cross in the heathen world. We would not, however, take upon us to vouch for the safety of a northern abolitionist, if he was known to be such, even while "sitting at the hospitable fire-sides" of slaveholders. But it must be remembered, that we do not speak of them, *en masse*. We hope, nay, we are sure, many of them are "lovers of hospitality, lovers of good men." This slavery is a "Delilah sin," it is very alluring. We must take care, that it does not beguile us with its wiles. It is attended with elegance and fashionable politeness. It adds very much to our ease. The sentence pronounced by our Creator, is amongst slave-holders revoked, "in the sweat of thy face, shalt thou eat bread," and the injunction of the Apostle, "he that does not work, should not eat." The slave-holder is perfectly at leisure to entertain company, which adds very much to the comfort of a visitor; and the lordly mistress thinks it beneath her dignity to "lay her hands to the spindle, or her hands to take hold of the distaff;" she has others to look to the ways of her household; she is at liberty "to eat the bread of idleness." Hence, with a retinue of servants to administer to our necessities, and faring sumptuously every day, in society with those who are clothed in purple and fine linnen, we certainly would "feel ourselves at home, when seated at their comfortable firesides." It is no wonder under those agreeable circumstances, that it would be recoiling to our feelings, to think that slavery was essentially in its nature immoral. But alas! let us examine the other side of the picture. All these enjoyments are purchased at the expense of the blood and sweat of our fellow men, wrested from them by cruel oppression, and are, in a majority of cases, the means of preventing us from entering into heaven ourselves, and hindering those that would. 'We have previously said, that hospitality is a commendable virtue, if conducted on christian principles. But "he that oppresseth the poor to increase his riches, and he that giveth to the rich, shall surely come to want."

We believe that holding property in man, is a flagrant violation of morality. In the first place, it is robbing God of the services of his creatures; and secondly, it is robbing man of one of his dearest rights, the right he has to his own faculties, both bodily and mental, for the promotion of the glory of God and his own happiness, both for time and eternity. What, not immoral to rob God? When did God relinquish his claim to the right of property in man? He says, "behold all souls are mine, as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the Son is mine." And when did he relinquish this claim to the services of man? "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter, fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." What, not immoral to rob a man of his natural rights? That he has natural rights, is self-evident. That a just and holy God, might have withheld those rights, is not the question. God seeing proper to continue us in existence, those rights are essential to the nature of our existence, and he has instituted civil government for the protection of those rights, that the strong may not wrest them from the weak. God does not require of us to make brick without straw: natural inabilities are insurmountable. These rights are essentially necessary, to qualify man to answer the end for which he was created. And is it not the essence of man-stealing, to extort these rights from him? What has the slave done to forfeit his rights? Why are they wrested from him? Is it because a vertical sun looked on his ancestors, and left its indelible impress? Is it because he is black? From whence, we say, *did* you get the right of property in

him ? Not from God ; and he is the sole proprietor. Or is he your property, because he or his ancestors were flagitiously torn from their country, by as fiendish a banditti of depredators, as ever disgraced the human family, and you have the power to perpetuate the wrong ? You know he or his ancestors were *stolen* ; well, “ he that stealeth a man or selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.” Let our beloved professing christian brethren, who are slave-holders, if any such will favor us with a perusal of this essay, consider this matter.— This slave, man, woman or child, as the case may be, is found in your hand—you paid your money for him, or obtained him by paternal inheritance ; so did the Ishmaelites pay money for Joseph, and his brethren had as good a right to sell him, as any other individuals can have to sell an unoffending man. Yet Joseph says, “ indeed I was *STOLEN* away from the land of the Hebrews.” The statute against man-stealing, was not confined to the Jewish dispensation, as the Apostle recognizes its authority as binding. How long will it be necessary to retain stolen property, before the holder can have a just claim to it ? Every person knows, that a defect in the original title to a piece of property, according to civil law, invalidates the title arising out of every subsequent transfer. Now it is not in this case as it might be in some other cases of property, where the proper owner is not known, for we know that every man has a right to himself, subject always to the Great Proprietor. The very fact of this statute being given by God, shows conclusively, that man was never accounted *property*, as death was not the penalty for stealing *property*. They that stole property, were only to restore four-fold, but he that stole a human being *must die*. May we not most justly give as one reason ? “ because in the image of God made he man.” It was a direct insult to the Great Creator, in whose image man was created, to *tear him from his seat, where he sat with dominion, to thrust him down on a level with the brute, whose lord he was constituted*. A second reason is, because there has been an inestimable ransom paid for man. God said of the Jews, “ they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as bondmen”—because they were God’s servants, whom he had redeemed from Egyptian bondage, in token of a more glorious redemption from sin. This word of salvation is to be preached, to every human being. A third reason is, because to “ fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man.” It would be an anomaly in the moral system, to make him depend on the will of his fellow *worm*, for the performance of these duties. It would be robbing him of his sacred rights, which were as dear to him as life. So much for the system itself.

As to the practical working, of this unnatural relation of master and slave ; we will select only one case by way of illustration ; in order to show that God’s precepts and this system are antagonistical : “ Search the scriptures.” To obey this precept, persons must first be taught to *read*. Now, we know that slaves are prohibited from being learned to read, because the necessity of the case requires it. We have no idea, that slave-holders exclude education from their slaves, out of a pure love of keeping them in ignorance ; as well-informed slaves would certainly add to their usefulness ; but the safety of the whole system requires such a course ; Sampson’s eyes must be put out, before it is safe to put him to grind in the prison house. If their minds were illuminated, it would be impossible to hold them as slaves, they would break their chains, as did Sampson the green withs, wherewith he was bound, as a thread of tow

is broken when it touches the fire. Every thing about them in this Republican country, is calculated to kindle into a conflagration the latent spark of liberty, which is implanted in every human breast. There has indeed been individual slaves, partially educated, particularly where they are not numerous, without such disastrous consequences to the system. But it would not do to diffuse education where they are numerous.— Knowledge being power, the slave-holder is under the necessity, to remove the key of knowledge, as it would unlock his treasures. "Woe unto you, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge, ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in, ye hindered." Appalling sentence! Now it is manifest, that the very existence of the system itself, cannot be maintained without coming in collision, with the precepts of God's word. Why find fault with the slave-holder for not educating his slaves, if it is a lawful system? Is he under any obligation to give propelling power to a machinery, which would blow his superstructure to atoms? Every avenue must as much as possible be closed, where light might enter, to illuminate the mind of the slave. For "oppression would make a wise man mad." A man void of wisdom does not know when he is oppressed. If a slave is lawful property—"for him knowledge must never open her treasures—nature never unfold her beauties,"—but his mind must be forever shrouded in darkness—shut out from the privilege of "searching the Scriptures," and from the comfort of their consolatory promises for the oppressed and afflicted; and of all the human family, they stand in the most need of the consolations of the Gospel. "Behold the tears of the oppressed, but they have no comforter."

We will now endeavor to answer some arguments, which are given in justification of slavery. It is said that slavery, having existed from an early period of the world, until the cannon of scripture was completed, and receiving no reproof, it cannot be immoral in itself. But it is not true that it was never reproofed. The great moral principles of God's law utterly condemn it. It was formally reproofed. What was the land of Egypt left in an utter desolation for, but for slave-holding? And it was not of so aggravated a character as our American slavery; and they surely came by their slaves as honestly as we did by ours. Did not God teach us a lesson by his judgments on Pharaoh, that he will have the services of his rational creatures, and *they* incur his judgments, who will place any obstacles in the way of his receiving them? His command to Pharaoh was, "Let my people go, that they may serve me." Indeed there is no other sin rebuked in scripture, oftener than "oppression."— We think it scarcely necessary to offer arguments, to show that slavery is oppression. Were not the Jews most awfully rebuked for the sin of slave-holding? (Jeremiah xxxiv. 17,) but it may be said that it was for holding their *brethren* in slavery. Are not all mankind brethren under the gospel dispensation? Would you suppose that the Jews would have such severe penalties inflicted on them for enslaving a brother Jew, and that christians would be licensed depredators on their brethren? Is the standard of moral obligation of love to our neighbor, any lower under the Christian dispensation, than under the Jewish? Was not the penal statute against man-stealing, a complete interdiction to slavery, as it dried up the fountain from whence it flowed; as God never gave any individual the right of property to his fellow man, he could not sell a right he never had: therefore no man could be made a slave but by stealing him, and that is the very way slaves are obtained at the present day. We will not stop to enquire, how far it might have been morally right, to enslave cap-

tives taken in war, in certain cases ; but it is evident it would be morally wrong to enslave their *children*.

The servitude of the heathen that was sanctioned under the Jewish dispensation was evidently a voluntary contract for an equivalent, and was conceived in love, and consummated in mercy, and the fiftieth year Jubilee was instituted for the release of such as stood out in their heathen state : had not this been the case, it would have been superfluous to have appointed the fiftieth year ; as the Jews went out every seventh year. It need not be said that it was for the release of property, for the words of the statute are definite, "and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and *proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.*" On the day of atonement, when they were fasting and afflicting their souls, the great Jubilee trumpet was blown ; this was the fast which the Lord did choose to undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free. Scripture does not say in precise language, you shall not make a *slave* of your *brother man*, or in other words, you shall not hold him, as you do the brute, viz. as your *property*. Does scripture say, that you may hold him as your *slave*, and that he is your *property* ? the burden of proof devolves on our opponents. Nothing less than a clear deed of grant, from the *great Proprietor*, will do in a case which is so repugnant to every sense of moral justice. What unparalleled arrogance must it be, for any human being to think, that for his sole use, his brother *man lives, moves and has his being*, and that it was for *his pleasure, that he was and is created*. What "proud boasters and lovers of their own selves" must such persons be !

It would make a bad code of moral ethics, to say that every thing which was practised in scripture history was right, if God did not immediately reprove it. Did God approve of Noah's and Lot's drunkenness, because he did not reprove them ? Did he approve of a most abhorrent deed of incest, which was perpetrated in Lot's family ? Did he approve of Jacob's deception to obtain the blessing ? Or did he approve of Rahab's telling lies ? with numerous other cases, where there is not a word of reproof administered. God has spread out great principles of rectitude in his law, which is our rule of duty, and not the example of every transgressor of these precepts spoken of in scripture, without getting a formal rebuke.

On approaching the New Testament, the supporters and apologists of slavery find most convincing arguments for their side of the question, which prove slavery right to a mathematical demonstration ; at least that it is so innocent and harmless, that Christianity and it can shake hands and live very amicably together ! Slavery, they say, existed in the days of Christ and his Apostles in its worst form, and neither Christ nor his apostles gave it a word of rebuke ; and the Apostles in writing to the different churches, gave directions to master and servant, in reference to the discharge of their reciprocal duties, which they consider equivalent to a recognition of the lawfulness of slavery. What a slanderous libel on Christ and his Apostles in the house of his friends ?

Our pro-slavery friends are rather *fast*. It remains yet to be proved, that the Roman Christians held servants by the same tenure which slaves were held in the Roman empire, and that it was actually to such *masters* and *slaves*, that the Apostle gave directions. We have previously said that nothing but positive testimony will do in such a case as this. When an institution claims its origin from God, so antagonistical to all his other institutions, nothing but positive testimony can give it credence. Can it

be supposed, that God authorised a system by which all his laws would be nullified? We thought, that God's laws were absolute and inflexible. There is nothing more than a bare possibility, to say the most of it, that even slavery was ever tolerated by the Apostles in the Christian Church. Possibilities will not do for evidence in any case, particularly when there is a weight of testimony against them.

[To be continued]

ART. VII. *Atheism or the personal existence of God denied.*

The prevalence of Transcendental philosophy in and around Boston is producing strange effects on Unitarianism. With such a basis, it can no longer be what it formerly was. The new forms which it is taking are various. Some of the Transcendentalists show a considerable amount of religious feeling, and appear to be almost orthodox: while others embrace various new modifications of error. Of late, quite a sensation has been produced among them by a discourse of Mr. Emerson, in which he is understood to deny the personal existence of God.

Mr. Emerson was formerly pastor of a Unitarian church in Boston, where he became conspicuous by advocating the disuse of the Lord's Supper, which he considered an antiquated ordinance, needed only in the first ages of Christianity. For several years past, he has been engaged in various literary pursuits. Notwithstanding something of mysticism in his style of thought, he is an exceedingly elegant writer. He was selected by the last graduating class of the Theological Department of Harvard College, to deliver an address before them. That address, which has been published, is said to contain the startling doctrine to which we have alluded. We have not seen the address, but we gather from the notices of it that we have seen, and from our own knowledge of his train of thought for some years past, that he considers God to be merely those principles, or eternal, immutable truths, which govern the universe; the laws, for example, of gravitation, electricity, and the like, in the world of matter, and the laws which connect happiness with virtue and pain with crime in the moral world. The idea of a **LIVING GOD**, a being conscious of his own existence, who enforces these laws and produces the effects that take place according to them, he would consider as a fiction of the human mind for its own convenience, useful in its day as a means of enabling men to conceive clearly of the existence of those laws, and to depend on the certainty of their execution; but which may be laid aside by the cultivated intellect in this age of light. The Bible and Christianity, we presume, he does not profess to reject, but considers them as containing the true system of the universe, exhibited in the best form of which the human mind, in those dark ages, was capable.

The appearance of this doctrine among them has caused not a little alarm and anxiety in the Unitarian ranks. Is Unitarianism coming to this? Does it lead to this? Shall it have the reputation of leading men to this? And all our Transcendental brethren, whose numbers and talents, especially among the younger, are far from contemptible,—are they coming to this? And if so, what will become of Unitarianism itself? If Atheism,—for such they consider it—is to be advocated by our pastors, what will become of the flocks? These are very serious questions: and

the apprehensions which they imply have caused some discussion. A sermon has been published in reply to Mr. Emerson's address, and several articles have appeared in the papers.

In one respect, this is the most plausible, and therefore the most dangerous form of infidelity, that we have yet seen. At first view, it *appears* to leave the whole code of morals unimpaired. The laws of morality, inward and outward, instead of being nullified or changed by it, are deified. And their sanctions have quite an imposing appearance. God,—that is, the unchangeable laws of the universe,—is omnipotent and omnipresent, and will certainly make the virtuous happy and the vicious miserable. But for this good appearance, we are sure that a gentleman of Mr. Emerson's taste, feelings and moral habits could not have adopted it. We have thought it might be useful, therefore, to examine its claims in respect to this very point: especially as we believe that the opposite doctrine, the personal existence of the **LIVING GOD**, is not realized as it needs to be, by vast multitudes, and even by many really pious persons.

Are then the moral laws which should govern us, unaffected by Mr. Emerson's doctrine? Far from it. Our whole duty to God is changed, if not annihilated. If he is not the **LIVING GOD**; if he does not *know* what he is doing and *intend* our welfare when he does us good, he certainly has no claim upon our *gratitude*. No man feels thankful to the principles of arithmetic, for the answers which he procures by means of them. They do not intend his benefit, and therefore have no claim upon his gratitude. Nor can we feel thankful to the laws of planetary motion, for the regular succession of "seed time and harvest, summer and winter, day and night." Why should we? The laws of planetary motion do not foresee our wants, feel compassion or kindness for us, and turn the world about as our necessities require, with the intention of doing us good.

It is no answer to say, that the God to whom we should be thankful is not one particular law, but the sum-total of the laws of the universe. There is nothing to build gratitude upon in that total, which is not equally found in all its parts. The laws of the universe are as destitute of consciousness, of knowledge, of kind intention, as the particular laws of planetary motion.

We *cannot* be thankful to the principles of the universe for our existence even; for those principles, when they brought us into existence, were not even aware of their own existence, and could not intend to make us, or know that they were doing it. Gratitude implies the recognition of kind intentions in our benefactor; and therefore it cannot be felt, where we know that no kindness was intended. On Mr. Emerson's principles, it would be absurd to thank God for any thing.

This doctrine, too, annihilates all that *confidence in God*, which is founded on a belief that he is kindly disposed towards us. We cannot trust in him as a God of mercy. We cannot believe that, "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." His mercy can be nothing but a blind, unconscious rule, by which the connexion between crime and pain is sometimes severed. He has no *feeling* of mercy towards us, for he has no feeling at all, of any kind. The principles of the universe are at work, carrying all things on, straight forward; and our destiny must be just what this vast machinery necessarily grinds out for us. We may rely, as much as our knowledge will enable us to do, on the stability of the laws by which all events are govern-

ed; but we may not feel that a superior intelligence watches over events, with a kind regard for our welfare.

Prayer, according to this doctrine, is absurd. What traveller, apprehending danger from the explosion of a boiler, prays to the laws which regulate the expansive force of steam? Who, when he eats, prays to the principles of physiology, that the food may be digested and made to strengthen him? What manufacturer humbly entreats the principles of gravitation to act on the water and turn the wheels of his machinery? Especially, prayer for pardon can have no place. He who detects himself in an arithmetical error, *cannot*, seriously and honestly, confess his sin to the principles of arithmetic, and implore their forgiveness. Such confessions and petitions, from their very nature, can be made in earnest only to some *person*, supposed to be capable of hearing, understanding and pardoning.

Nor can the believer in this doctrine possibly feel any *reverence* for God. He cannot feel that God is voluntarily wise and good, and therefore worthy of veneration. Indeed, he cannot feel that God is, in strictness of speech, either wise or good at all; as wisdom and goodness are, strictly, attributes of some intelligent being. The believer in this doctrine cannot *look up* to a being of a higher and holier nature than his own. His God, to be sure, operates incessantly, accurately, and irresistibly; but blindly, without intention, and without knowing what he does. The believer is conscious of his own existence, and perceives and understands the things around him; and therein is superior to his imagined God. He must, therefore, be destitute of that humility, which a contrasting of himself with the **LIVING GOD** would inspire.

A believer in this doctrine cannot regard himself as *morally accountable to God*. He may perceive the *advantage* of doing as God prescribes. He may see the necessity of avoiding crime, if he would escape pain. He may see the mighty wheels of the universe rolling on, according to fixed and unalterable laws; and may be aware that he must conform his movements to theirs, or be crushed. But his feeling must be the same in kind with that of a man standing upon a rail-road, when he sees the engine approaching—a mere sense of the necessity of moving out of the way, to avoid being crushed. He cannot feel that God has any *claims* upon him which it would be not only dangerous, but wrong, to disregard. He cannot feel that God *cares* how he conducts, is *pleased* when he obeys, or *displeased* when he sins. He may believe that his own is a sort of self-registering thermometer, on which all its own acts are recorded, so that their legitimate effects on his future pleasures and pains are inevitable; but he cannot feel that God literally *observes* his action, or *intends* to call him to account for them.

Whether this doctrine makes equal havoc of the laws which should govern our conduct towards men, we have not time now to enquire; but we are sure that it seriously affects the probability of their observance. For this, there are two obvious reasons. Man needs the ideas and feelings which, as we have shown, this belief excludes, to tame his proud and wayward spirit, to give him humble and submissive emotions, and to subject his heart to the dominion of law. Without a God to love, revere and trust, the heart of man cannot be made the home of virtuous emotions. And man needs to feel, also, that his fellow men are dear to God; that if he injures them, God sees it and is displeased; that if good is done to them, God rejoices in their happiness. He needs to feel that, in caring for their happiness, he sympathises with God; and that in promoting it,

he is working together with God. He who feels nothing of this, will not feel towards his fellow men as he ought. And as to the laws of the universe,—he may think that Moses and the prophets did not calculate their operation correctly, and that, though those laws will certainly be executed, he may do many things which the Bible forbids, and yet receive no injury from them.

Mr. Emerson's doctrine, therefore, does not meet the wants of our moral nature; it does not enable us to fulfil the demands of conscience: it deprives us of many ideas without which we cannot be what we know we ought to be; and, therefore, according to an important principle of the Transcendental philosophy, it must be false —*N. Y. Observer.*

ART. VII. *Family Government, by Dr. Humphrey.*

From the New-York Observer.

The importance of family government will scarcely be questioned by any one, and we of this generation are quite ready to flatter ourselves that we understand it better than our fathers did. Whether we do or not, will, in the lapse of time, be submitted to a more impartial judgment. I am sure, that could those who have been gone a hundred years return to the "places which knew them," they would be at a loss to guess how we expect to substantiate such a claim in the eyes of posterity.

Although, as I have already remarked, the state has no right to interfere with the domestic arrangements of families, except in extreme cases, it is nevertheless true, that in order to become good citizens in after life, children must be accustomed to cheerful subordination in the family, from their earliest recollection. I know that those who grow up without restraint by the fire-side, and whose youth is consequently as wild as the winds, *can* be governed afterwards by absolute power. The bayonet of the Czar and the scimiter of the Sultan can tame them and keep them in subjection. But it may well be doubted, whether any thing like a free constitutional government can ever be maintained over a people who have not been taught the fifth commandment in their childhood. I do not believe it can. Children must be prepared to reverence the majesty of the laws, and to yield a prompt obedience to the civil magistrate, by habitual subjection to their parents. If they are not governed in the family, they will be restive under the wholesome and necessary restraints of after life; and the freer the form of government is, in any state, the more necessary is it that parents should fit their children "to lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty" under it, by a proper course of domestic training. We cannot, in this country, hope to preserve and hand down our free and glorious institutions in any other way. To remain free, the mass of the people must be virtuous and enlightened; and to this end, domestic education, including all suitable restraints and discipline, must engage the earnest attention of heads of families throughout the land. It has been said a thousand times, that the practicability of maintaining a highly republican form of government has been *tried* and *settled* in the United States, however it may have failed everywhere else. I wish it were so: but I am afraid the question is settled, so far *only* as we have gone. What the future may disclose, who can certainly tell? It is yet a grand desideratum, whether we

have religion, virtue, and intelligence enough to sustain our blessed institutions. The danger is, that our liberties will degenerate into licentiousness, and that the growing laxity of family government will hasten on the fearful crisis. There is, if I am not deceived, a reaction in our unparalleled political freedom, upon our domestic relations. It is more difficult than it was, half, or even a quarter of a century ago, for parents to "command their household after them." Our children hear so much about liberty and equality, and are so often told how glorious it is to be "born free and equal," that it is hard to make them understand for what good reason their liberties are abridged in the family; and I have no doubt this accounts, in multitudes of instances, for the reluctance with which they submit to parental authority. The boy wants to be "his own man," long before his wisdom teeth are cut; and the danger lies in conceding the point to him, under the notion, that our fathers were quite too rigid, and that a more indulgent domestic policy, corresponding with the "spirit of the age," is better. This may be the way to make *rulers* enough for a hundred republics; but not to make a single good *subject*. I repeat, therefore, that if it is important to secure a prompt obedience to the wholesome laws of the state, then is family government indispensably necessary, and the father who takes no care to control his own sons, is not himself a patriot, if he is a good citizen.

Moreover, without family government there will be very little *self-government* in any community. If you do not restrain the waywardness of your child, in its early developments, and thus assist him to get the mastery of it while yet the conquest is comparatively easy, it will be in vain for you to expect him ever to gain that self-control which is so essential to his happiness and safety. Nothing is better settled by the experience of all ages, than that the will grows stubborn—that evil passions become impetuous by indulgence; and that indulged they will be, by the child, if they are not held in check by parental authority. In this view, a greater misfortune can hardly befall a young person, than to be left to himself. The consequence is, that before reason and conscience can assert their supremacy, bad habits are formed, and his depraved inclinations have time to ripen into such maturity, that to bring them into subjection is infinitely more difficult than if the work had been commenced in the nursery. One in a hundred, perhaps, may, without aid, learn to "rule his own spirit;" but it will cost him many a hard struggle; while the ninety and nine will never have resolution and perseverance enough to achieve any tolerable degree of self-control. How many slaves to an irascible temper have lamented to their dying day that their fathers did so little to check its early growth! But what individual, in after life, was ever sorry for the aid which he received from his parents in mastering his own bad passions!

There is one thought more, which may not perhaps so readily occur, but which is too important to be overlooked in this connection. The judicious and faithful exercise of family government puts children in the way of receiving spiritual blessings. I am not one of those who believe that any human agency or moral suasion can convert the soul to God. Bringing up a child under perfect subjection to parental authority, is a very different thing from the bringing him to the foot of the cross. Still, there may be a connexion between them; and I cannot entertain a doubt, that the child who is well governed in his father's house, is more likely to be brought to a willing submission to God, than if he had been left to "walk in the way of his own heart, and after the sight of his own

eyes." I know the best governed son in the world *may* hold out in rebellion against his Heavenly Father till he dies; but there is a great deal more reason to hope he will "throw down his arms," than in the case of one who has never been taught the first lessons of submission in the family. Let me guard, with all possible care, against being misunderstood. No power on earth can conquer the stubborn will of the sinner, however young. But there is a divine constitution, by which means and ends are sometimes remotely, and sometimes more immediately connected together; and why may not parental fidelity in the government of a family be made a principal means of bringing them to the "obedience of Christ?"

It is thought by some, that the government of children must be a very easy if not even a delightful task. I do not recollect, however, that I ever heard this sentiment expressed by a parent who had been placed in circumstances to make the trial, and who had succeeded in any tolerable degree. As a general rule, persons know how to manage families much better before they have them, than afterwards. Those who are most astonished at the failure of their friends in this important matter, and see no difficulty at all in holding the reins, have no children to govern. The bachelor who boards in his brother's family, or goes to spend a few weeks with a married sister, understands the thing perfectly; and can discourse most eloquently upon family government by the hour together. He has it all at his fingers ends, from A to Z, and knows exactly what to do from sunrise till bed time. O how he wishes he could have the management of these lawless little urchins for a month. He would stop their crying and romping, or he would quit the premises. How parents can have so little tact, and be so indulgent, is entirely beyond his comprehension. But it is often exceedingly amusing to see how the tables are turned, when he comes to have a family of his own. Poor man! the children spoil his beautiful theories a great deal faster than he ever made them. What the matter is, he cannot tell; but it is infinitely more difficult to govern them than it used to be.

Heads of families, in like manner, who have no children of their own, are very apt to think that their friends who have, are very unfortunate or very much to blame, in not keeping them under better subjection. O, if they had the management of them they should be governed to a charm! It should always be sunshine. Every look should be a law, and it should be obeyed. Or if it should sometimes be necessary to go a little further, every word of reproof should be treasured up and remembered to the end of life. But how does the matter stand, when these same persons come to adopt a child, and bring their theories to the test of experience? In nine instances out of ten, they find the task incomparably more difficult than they expected. It is one thing to build castles in the air, and another to garrison them. They are sure the child is uncommonly perverse, or that if it was their own child, they could manage it a great deal better. But the sober truth is, that whatever else may be easy, the bringing up of a family is a great undertaking. To govern one's own house, just as he should, is exceedingly difficult, and the parent who has the talent, and who is enabled to use it as he ought, can never be thankful enough to God for so invaluable a gift.

(To be continued)

ART. VIII. *Proceedings of the Convention of Reformed Churches at its Sessions in the City of Pittsburgh, Oct. 17, 1838.*

The above is the title of a pamphlet which has just come into our hands. The character and object of the Convention whose proceedings it contains, may in a good measure be learned from the following extract taken from the first page :

The Convention of such Reformed Churches as had previously concurred in the measure, and appointed their Delegates, which had been invited for the purpose of devising measures for the promotion of the unity of the Church of God, upon scriptural principles, met in the Second Associate Reformed Church, in the city of Pittsburgh, Oct. 17, 1838, at 7 o'clock P. M., and was opened by a sermon from the Rev. John Black, D. D., from John xvii. 21, "*That they all may be one : as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us : that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" After the religious exercises of the evening were over, the Rev. Dr. Black was called to the chair, *pro tem.*, in order that the Delegates might be ascertained, and the Convention permanently organized.

It was then ascertained that Delegates were in attendance, whose appointment was duly certified, from three of the ecclesiastical Bodies of our country, as follows, viz :

From the Associate Reformed Synod of the West :

Rev. JOHN T. PRESSLY, D. D. Alleghenytown ; Rev. JOSEPH R. KERR, Pittsburgh ; Rev. WILLIAM WALLACE, Wheeling, Va.

From the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York :

Rev. JOHN M'JIMSEY, D. D. Montgomery, N. Y. ; Rev. DONALD C. M'LAREN, Caledonia, N. Y. ; Mr. WILLIAM M'KEE, Ruling Elder, Philadelphia.

From the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church :

Rev. JOHN BLACK, D. D. Pittsburgh ; Rev. WILLIAM WILSON, New-York ; Mr. DANIEL M'MILLAN, Ruling Elder, Xenia, Ohio.

On motion, The Rev. Dr. PRESSLY was unanimously chosen President, and the Rev. WM. WILSON, Secretary of the Convention.

The Associate Reformed Church originated in a union, which was effected in 1782, between some members of the Associate and some of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This union only created an additional denomination in the Christian Church, as the Associate and Reformed Presbyterian churches still maintained their distinct and separate existence. In process of time the *Union Church* became divided into three different and independent bodies ; and the Reformed Presbyterian Church has also of late been rent in twain. The delegates composing the above mentioned Convention, it will be seen, belong to two of the Union or Associate Reformed Bodies, and to one branch (the lesser) of the Reformed Presbyterians. And the object, to which the labors of the Convention were particularly directed, was, it appears, to consummate a union between these three bodies. Union is very desirable ; and all

lawful endeavors to promote it must be laudable. And for our own part we do not see but these three bodies (as they are not *over-much* strict) might come together and be united into one, without making any particular compromise of principle.

The most important matter transacted by this Convention, was the adoption of the following Report on the subject of inter-communion:

The Committee to whom was recommitteed the report on "the nearer approximation of the several Churches represented in this Convention," were called upon to report, which they accordingly did. The whole report was then unanimously adopted. It is as follows:

The Committee appointed to consider in what "the nearer approximation of the several Churches represented in this Convention, with a view to their ultimate union into one body," shall consist; would respectfully submit the following

REPORT:—Your Committee are persuaded, that this subject is highly important, not only in its ultimate result—the contemplated and hoped for union of the Reformed Churches in one ecclesiastical body, but also in all the steps leading thereto. The object before this Committee is a "nearer approximation" of these Churches, while yet in a divided state, with a view to organical union, before that union has actually taken place. Such an approximation, if rightly conducted, is greatly to be desired, and would gladden the hearts of all who love the unity, the peace, and the prosperity of Zion. The Church is the mother of all true believers, and every dutiful and loving son, will grieve at heart when the bowels of his mother are rent and torn by divisions among her children. And it is a lamentable fact, that the spouse of the Redeemer, like her Lord, has been wounded in the house of her friends. To endeavor to heal her wounds, and bind up the broken hearted, is alike the duty, the privilege and the delight, of all who love her and seek her good. Yet we must be careful not to attempt to "heal the hurt of the daughter of his people slightly," or to "say peace, peace, when there is no peace." Are we called to build up the broken wall of Jerusalem, let us beware of "daubing it with untempered mortar," lest the Lord pronounce its doom, and "bring it down to the ground," and it be said unto us, "Where is the daubing where with ye have daubed it?" Let us take warning from past experience upon this subject. In every association among men there is some kind of communion. How far may communion consistently extend in the contemplated "nearer approximation?" Men enjoy a social and friendly communion in conversing together—in walking or riding in company, and in a thousand things relating to the transactions and courtesies of life. In all these there is something common, in which men have a fellowship or communion with one another. It is mere civil communion, and is not sinful. Again, there is a religious communion which all Christians may lawfully hold with one another, upon the ground of their common faith as disciples of Christ, their common Lord, and as partakers of the common salvation. Union, in every case, is the basis of communion. And all Christians are agreed and united in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the only Saviour. They may, therefore, hold Christian communion together, which will include all religious exercises which do not embrace ecclesiastical fellowship, such as joining together in reading, hearing, praying, praising God, &c. In all these, all Christians may walk together, because they are agreed. Further,

there is a communion, which may be called ministerial, which adds to mere Christian fellowship that which is official, and yet not ecclesiastical communion. The organization and government of the Church is more than ministerial. It is Presbyterian. Ministerial communion is, therefore, not organical. Ministers, therefore, though belonging to different denominations, may, nevertheless, have intercourse with each other in all those official duties not embracing ecclesiastical communion.

Therefore Resolved, As the judgment of this Convention, that the ministers of the Churches here represented, may interchange pulpits, and it is recommended to both ministers and people to unite as often as opportunity offers in meetings for prayer or religious exercises—and in all such as may be engaged in works intended to advance the cause of Christianity, by spreading the word of God and the gospel of Jesus Christ; thereby cultivating a spirit of harmony and brotherhood, calculated to lead to a more perfect unity—and this without violating any of the laws of their respective organizations.

It will be seen from the above Report that the Convention adopted Dr. Mason's scheme of Catholic Communion in its widest latitude. They lay it down as a principle that all professing christians may commune together at the Lord's table who agree in the belief that Jesus Christ is the *only Saviour*. This is doubtless their meaning, although it be somewhat clouded by the use of *ambiguous* phrases and technical terms. For the communion, which christians, holding the above truth, may have with each other, "includes," say they, "all religious exercises which do not embrace ecclesiastical fellowship, such as joining together in reading, hearing, praying, praising God, &c." *Eating the Lord's supper* is not here mentioned but is included in the expressive, "&c.;" and perhaps it would have shown more plainness and candor had this "religious exercise" been mentioned, instead of using in its place a very ambiguous *character*. If we understand the Convention, and we think we do, by "ecclesiastical communion" they simply mean a communion in church *government* and *discipline*. Hence, ministers and members of different denominations may commune together in every thing excepting in the government and discipline of the church, which is more than *christian* fellowship, and more than *ministerial*—it is *organical*.

Whether the ministers and members of the churches represented in this Convention, will be generally disposed to favor this unlimited scheme of Catholic Communion, remains to be seen. We cannot disguise it, however, that we felt some surprise that the delegates from the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York should have voted in favor of this scheme, since that Synod had, a few weeks before, passed a Resolution "disapproving of the principle and practice of open communion." (See Monitor for Nov. p. 274.) But it may be said that the *second* resolution which the Synod passed nullified the *first*, as it permits the practice of

"occasional communion." However that may be, one thing is certain, that the second resolution nullifies itself; it is more than *ambiguous*, it is flatly contradictory, as the reader may see by turning to it.—But we have not time for any further comments.

ART. IX. *Miscellaneous Items.*

SYNOD OF CINCINNATI.—At the late meeting of this Judicatory, a separation took place. After the separation, the New School Synod passed some strong *Abolition Resolutions*. And according to the EMANCIPATOR, the Old School Synod adopted the following Preamble and Resolution; but according to the PRESBYTERIAN, they were passed by the New School Synod. Will the PRESBYTERIAN explain?

"Whereas, the General Assembly of 1818, expressed its strong opposition to slavery, and declared it to be "manifestly the duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day, when the inconsistency of slavery, both with the dictates of humanity and religion, has been demonstrated and is generally seen and acknowledged, to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavors to correct the errors of former times, and as speedily as possible to efface the blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and, if possible, throughout the world"—therefore,

"Resolved, That the next General Assembly be respectfully entreated to institute an inquiry into this matter in all our Presbyteries, in order to ascertain whether this duty has been neglected; and if so, to take such order on the subject as will tend to hasten the emancipation of the oppressed."

A "LAMB."—We find it stated in the Glasgow Scottish Guardian, that "The Archbishop of Paris had made a splendid offering to the church of Notre Dame de Deliverance, in Normandy, in fulfilment of a vow he had made conditionally on the conversion of Talleyrand. The offering, which is an image of a lamb, has inscribed on its pedestal words to this effect: 'Offered to the Holy Virgin, the mother of God, in grateful commemoration of her Divine grace, in bringing back a *stray lamb* to the fold of God's church.'" If Talleyrand were still alive, this would doubtless make him cry "bah!" By the way, how did the archbishop ascertain that it was the grace of the *Virgin Mary*, that converted the great diplomatist? Is he sure that he has not presented his offering to the wrong saint?—*N. Y. Observer.*

BETTING ON ELECTIONS.—"The Legislature of this State have gone one step towards preserving the purity of our elections, by making it a misdemeanor, for any person to attempt bribery, menace, or other corrupt means or device whatsoever, to influence any elector in giving his vote, or to deter him from giving the same. There are, doubtless, individuals

of all parties, who are base enough at every election to violate this provision of the statute ; but we think the Legislature ought to go still farther, and to prevent as much as possible, one of the prominent causes which leads to its violation. If a man has money bet on the result of an election, he will often resort to the most foul means to procure votes, and when all others fail, he will directly purchase them, or employ other individuals to do so and run the risk of punishment. Those who bet their money become more interested in the hazard of the wager than in the success of the candidate, and doubtless expend a portion of the stake to win the other portion. It is a species of gambling which ought to be prohibited by fine and imprisonment. It is dangerous to the free right of suffrage. The man who bets on the throw of the die, or the turn of the wheel, is denounced as a gambler and blackleg, and why should not the same epithet be applied to him who bets on the events of an election ? The latter leads to more fatal consequences than the former. Even the inspectors of elections, those who are appointed to receive and canvass the votes often become deeply interested in a pecuniary measure in the success of a particular ticket or candidate, and can we have the same confidence in their fairness and integrity, when perhaps, by a single vote they may gain or lose large sums of money ? In every view which can be taken of the practice of betting on elections, it is not only demoralizing and pernicious, but it is dangerous to the freedom and purity of our elections, and we trust the next Legislature will pass severe laws against this system of gambling."

This we copy from the *Saratoga Sentinel*, a Van Buren paper. During the electioneering campaign, we saw several articles against the practice, in papers on the other side. We judge, therefore, that men of all parties were getting their eyes open to the abominable nature and tendencies of this species of gambling, and that there is some reason to hope it may be put down by law.—*N. Y. Obs.*

IMPORTANT CONCESSION.—We lately received through the Post Office a small Pamphlet containing a defence of slavery, which the author, Tho. M. Rice, calls "God's own institution." The following is the concluding paragraph, which concedes that slavery may be abolished on its own soil :

"These facts I present to a thinking community ; and I would they could be received in the same humble, conscientious spirit in which they have been written. I am no slave-holder ; I am a little Methodist preacher, and teacher in an obscure little village. I have never aspired to honor or preferment. But if I did not conscientiously believe what I have written, I would not remain in a slave-holding State one month.—For he who is in heart an abolitionist, and believes slavery to be as offensive to God as they profess to do, is unworthy the confidence or respect of any candid man, while he continues to live among those whose hands are defiled with its blood. It is vain to reply they cannot get away. If they have slaves they can liberate them here or take them into the boasted land of freedom with themselves ; and if the free States (as they are called) will not let the negroes come among them, they will be convicted at once of falsehood and hypocrisy, in not permitting the Africans to settle in their territory, while they permit many more aban-

doned and debauched from Europe and Asia. And if they have no slaves they can pack up and go.

Ballardsville, February 4th, 1838."

I, AND I, AND I, AND I, AND I, AND I.—*Ministers* are not very notorious for their *egotism*, but we find occasionally one, to whom the epithet *vain*, may properly apply.

"Great men are not always wise." *Ministers* are not always so. It is supremely disgusting to hear a man, and especially a Minister, talk for hours, in company, about himself. I gained such and such distinctions in College—in the Seminary. I have had such and such honorable offices. I have had such and such calls from New York or Boston, to occupy some station of important trust. Such egotists ought to know that even "*silly women*" are sometimes disgusted with their vanity, when they are compelled, for politeness sake to feign an interest in the declamations of self-praise.

When a man is settled over a large society, and has an affectionate people, lavish in their testimonials of affection, of interest in his preaching, conversation, &c. he has great occasion for watchfulness. "Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." Vanity, pride, self-conceit, and the whole train of such loathsome passions tempt the violation of this wise precept. And here—in *good people are not always wise*. They should remember there is much truth in the old adage, "Praise to the face is an open disgrace." The best of people are sufficiently prone to think of the little pronoun I, without being reminded of its importance. Suppose every Minister write a sermon on Spiritual Pride, and illustrate its evils by the experience of I!—*Boston Recorder*.

ART. X. Notices.

The "Short Sermon," which appeared in the last Monitor, should have been credited to the *Northern Watchman*.

A. R. is received and will be attended to as soon as practicable.

Mr. W. Y. Hamilton of the Western Mission is requested to forward to us the names of the individuals, with their respective Post Offices, who, as he formerly hinted, had paid in advance for the 14th vol. that they may be supplied with the present vol. Will he also please inform us, whether "Columbus" and "Shannon's Store," (Randolph Co. Ill.) designate one and the same P. O.?

We have just cause for complaint at the backwardness of those subscribers, who are in arrears, in forwarding to us their dues.

As we find that the "PRECIOUS REMEDIES" is not so scarce a work as we had at first supposed, we shall probably indulge our readers with but one more insertion from it.

Another insertion will finish the "Historical Sketch of the United Brethren." We hope that the pen of the author will soon find employment on some other interesting subject, wherewith to enrich our pages.

o

s
p,

t
or
s
i-
i-
at
y
as

e
n-
n-
ne
h
e-
is
"
I,
er
i-

ve

rd
es,
nat
rm
le-

ab-

as
out

ted
oy-
our

CONTENTS.

	page.
Ans. I. Historical sketch of the United Brethren, or Moravians. Continued from page 201.....	261
Ans. II. The Gospel hid to them that are lost.....	294
Ans. III. Recollections of a Sermon.....	306
Ans. IV. Obituary of the Rev. Samuel Deuthat.....	314
Ans. V. Slavery essentially immoral.....	319
Ans. VI. Personal existence of God denied.....	325
Ans. VII. Family Government.....	330
Ans. VIII. Proceedings of the Convention.....	331
Ans. IX. Miscellaneous Items.....	334
Synod of Cincinnati.....	334
A "Lamb".....	334
Setting on Elections.....	334
Important Conventions.....	335
I, and I, and I, and I, and I.....	335
Ans. X. Notices.....	336

New subscribers can be furnished with the present (the XV) volume from the beginning.

Persons wishing the XIV volume can be supplied with the same at half price.

Those subscribers who are in debt for the XIV, or any previous volume, are requested to make payment with all convenient speed. Letters enclosing \$5.00 or more, may be sent at our expense and risk.

JAMES MARTIN.

Receipts during the month of November by Mail.

☞ All persons having in their possession the names of subscribers to the DISCOURSES AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES, proposed to be published by Rev. J. P. Miller, will please forward them immediately either to him or the Rev. J. Martin.

CONFESSON OF FAITH: the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, with the scriptural proofs at large, new edition, just published by order of the Synod of the Associate Church of North America. For sale by
JAMES HENRY, 71 State-street, Albany.

AGENTS.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate Church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

Peter McArthur, Cambridge, Washington Co., N. Y.
A. Bishop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.
Alex. Gailley, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co., Pa.
Wm. McMillan, Potter's Mills, Centre Co., Pa.
Andrew Graham, Baltimore, Md.
Andrew Murro, Canonsburg, Pa.
Rev. Samuel Wilson, Xenia, Ohio.
James Gordon, Peoria, Livingston Co. N. Y.
Rev. James Rogers, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The's Connings, Prussia, Wash's Co. N. Y.
James Wilson, Esq., Penn Grove, York Co. Pa.
Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.
James Hutchinson, Esq., New London Conn
Banks, Chester Co. Pa.
John Smith, F. M., Pleasant Run, Carroll Co., Indiana.
John Anderson, Washington, Pa.
William S. Young, 123 Race-street, Philadelphia.
E. G. Starnes, F. M., Columbus, Kan. Co., Ill.

The RELIGIOUS MONITOR is published monthly, at \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance.